

Parks and Recreation Ten-Year Strategic Service Plan



Tucson Parks and Recreation

A plan for the future!

Foreword

Executive Summary

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Introduction | i |
| Mission | i |
| The Planning Process | ii |
| Vision | ii |
| Strategic Directions | iii |
| Implementation..... | iv |
| Overview | v |

Acknowledgements

Introduction

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| A Starting Place | 1 |
| Purpose..... | 2 |

Planning Process

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| The Process | 3 |
| Analysis and Findings | 4 |
| Visioning Process..... | 7 |
| Strategic Directions | 8 |

Strategic Directions

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| Connectivity..... | 9 |
| Natural Resources..... | 11 |
| Accessibility..... | 12 |
| Signature Parks..... | 14 |
| Maximize Resources | 15 |
| Lifetime Customers | 17 |


Appendices

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| A. Planning Process | 21 |
| B. Urban Pathway System | 27 |
| C. Natural Resources | 36 |
| D. Parks and Facilities Plan | 39 |
| E. Operational Recommendations..... | 60 |
| F. Park Classifications..... | 83 |

List of Tables and Exhibits

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Table 1: Service Area Analysis Guidelines..... | 6, 39 |
| Table 2: Linear Pathway Cost Estimate | 29 |
| Table 3: Linear Pathway Phasing..... | 31 |
| Urban Pathway System Map..... | 35 |
| Table 4: Parks and Facilities per Population Guidelines | 40 |
| Table 5: Projected Population | 41 |
| Table 5-A: Park Acres Per 1,000 Residents..... | 41 |
| Table 6: Future Park Expansion – Additional Facilities Needed to Achieve Guidelines | 42 |
| Table 7: Estimated Costs of Unfunded Needs by Planning Area | 43 |
| Table 8: Unmet Needs | 46 |
| Proposed Parks and Facilities Map..... | 47 |
| Stress Index Map..... | 48 |
| Park Inventory | 49 |
| Table 9: Tax Subsidy Level | 66 |

FOREWORD



City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department

In the Year 2000, the City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department embarked upon a strategic planning process to address the following significant questions:

- How can the City of Tucson continue to provide a park system that offers the highest quality facilities, programs and services for Tucsonans of all ages and abilities?
- How does the City ensure that the community's most important values are reflected in any efforts to accomplish this mission?
- How can the City build upon citizen input and involvement to create a vision that provides the impetus needed to achieve the quality of life vital to the health and well being of our community?

The "Parks and Recreation Ten Year Strategic Service Plan " provides a framework to focus staff energy, ensure progress towards common goals and assess and adjust department direction in response to an ever changing environment. The plan provides clearly defined strategic directions and goals that will guide future actions. Three-year action plans with annual performance measures to track progress will be established to ensure accountability. Each consecutive action plan will ensure needed flexibility to accommodate changing needs and environmental conditions while providing the desired community review and input to keep the plan current and relevant.

City of Tucson Parks & Recreation Ten-Year Strategic Service Plan October 31, 2006

This plan does not define future decisions that must be made. Instead, its purpose is to provide a framework to anticipate the future and guide decision-making in the present. This means that over time, staff must stay abreast of the changing environment in order to make the best possible decisions at any given moment. Management and planning must occur strategically. The plan is only a tool and not a substitute for the exercise of judgement by management as it answers the questions, "What are the most important parks and recreation issues and needs for the community?" and "How shall the department respond?"

The efforts of Dan Felix, former Parks and Recreation Director, are reflected in this document. Dan's leadership in the planning and formulation of this plan was invaluable. His commitment to Parks and Recreation and to the community have set a new and higher standard for excellence and the memory of his service will continue to inspire and motivate staff towards achieving the mission. Bob Martin and Liz Miller were also instrumental in continuing to guide the planning process during their interim tenures.

Fred H. Gray, Jr.
Director
Parks and Recreation Department

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Tucson is a growing community with a diverse population. Like many rapidly growing urban areas, Tucson recognizes the importance of long range planning to stay abreast of the needs of its citizens.

The purpose of this Strategic Service Plan is to provide a policy framework to guide future actions of the Department. Of primary concern are three challenges that are facing the Tucson Parks and Recreation Department:

1) Tucson is experiencing significant changes in the diversity of its population. The population is aging and becoming more diverse. In the year 2005, the Hispanic/Latino population represented 39% of the total community.

2) Geographically, the city is expanding. According to the U. S. Census Bureau, in 1990 the population was 405,390. By 2000, it had grown 18.3% to 496,575 people. The population is projected to increase to 569,980 by 2010 and to 595,385 by 2013.

3) There is a critical need to add to the existing parks and open space inventory to address current deficiencies and projected growth. As this plan indicates, additional open space is needed in growth areas as well as within the established areas of the City.

In order to meet these challenges, the Strategic Service Planning process has been driven by a community vision created by many sectors including the City Council, the community, City administration and the staff of the Parks and Recreation Department.

Through clearly defined strategic directions, this plan will provide the decision-making tools necessary for the Parks and Recreation Department to remain a vibrant and vital part of the Tucson community.

The strategic planning process resulted in the development of a mission statement that defines the purpose of the Department.

Mission

To provide a park system offering high quality facilities, programs and services for Tucsonans of all ages and abilities



The Planning Process

To help focus efforts and energy in the planning process, a framework for planning was adopted to encourage success. The three-step strategic and comprehensive planning process includes the following major elements:

Analysis and Findings

A comprehensive data collection process was initiated at the beginning of this project. The consultants, Leon Younger and PROS, Inc., conducted public meetings and administered citizen surveys, as well as interviews with Department staff, other City department heads, community leaders and elected officials. Taken collectively, the information yielded the following Community Core Values; these were identified as those values that are a priority for the majority of the community:

- Park accessibility
- Customer service
- Youth
- Seniors and Disabled Population
- Inclusion
- Equity
- Safety
- Family
- Recreation
- Health and Wellness
- Resource Management
- Environmental Stewards

The Parks and Recreation Department, assisted by the consultants, used these identified values to build a shared vision for the future.

Visioning Process

The visioning process is one that depends on understanding where an organization and community has been in the past and where it chooses to go in the future. The Parks and Recreation vision was created through extensive community involvement. The community outlined, through several input processes, what it values, what parts of the past should be included and updated in the plan, key trends it would like to see incorporated and the issues it felt were most important to address.

Communities are ever changing entities. In order to understand how a community is to change in the future it is necessary to appreciate its history and culture.

A vision has been created that reflects the assimilation of input and data from the community and the Department. This vision provides an overall direction for the future. It is important to remember that this document is dynamic and must change over time because the makeup and nature of the community is ever changing. As the culture of the community changes, adjustments will be made to the plan to address these changes.

Vision Statement

“The City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department will provide a variety of parks, recreation facilities and program experiences equitably throughout the community. Existing facilities will be aggressively maintained and additional facilities added as growth and demand dictate. Programs will be developed and maintained to the highest quality, ensuring a safe environment with exceptional service while developing a lifetime customer. Services will demonstrate a positive economic investment through partnerships with other service providers, both public and private, contributing to a high quality of life for Tucsonans.”

Strategic Directions

The final phase of the planning process was identifying strategic directions. Goals, objectives, and policies based on the vision and core values were summarized and prioritized with the staff. Future energies and efforts of the Department will focus on these initiatives by level of priority.

The strategic directions reflect the combined efforts of all staff involved in the planning process. As a result, this shared vision will help the organization progress to a changed environment driven by common goals.

The consulting team worked over twelve months actively listening to the Tucson community, collecting important data and projecting trends for the future. From this work, the Parks and Recreation Department staff and the consulting team created a plan to move the organization into the future. This movement can take place with the confidence that the community and staff have been heard and recommendations in the plan validate their input.



To achieve the vision, the Department has identified key **strategic directions** to drive the overall management of the parks and recreation system. Each strategic direction incorporates shared community values, and directly relates to the vision of the Department. Parks and Recreation managers and City officials alike will be able to use the following strategic directions as a tool for decision making in the future.

- Provide **CONNECTIVITY** between parks, open space and recreational facilities
- Protect **NATURAL RESOURCES**
- Provide **ACCESSIBILITY** to parks and recreation facilities
- Develop **SIGNATURE FACILITIES**
- **MAXIMIZE RESOURCES** in managing and operating parks, recreation facilities and programs
- Develop **LIFETIME CUSTOMERS**

Objectives have been developed for each strategic direction. The Department is committed to regular reviews of the strategic directions and the objectives. Both will be continually updated as determined by community needs.

IMPLEMENTATION

This Strategic Service Plan will be used as an aid to responsible and responsive decision-making for the future of the department. It incorporates a balance between maintenance of older facilities and creation of new facilities. There is an additional balance between active and passive recreation opportunities. It defines the importance of developing “lifetime customers”; services for everyone in our community, with an emphasis on the youngest and oldest members of the community. It essentially provides the information necessary to allow the Department to grow in response to the stated needs of the community.

This Plan was developed as an endeavor to look 10 years into the future. Everyone involved in the planning process was aware of the rapid pace of change and the need for a quick response to that change. Using the Strategic Directions identified in the Plan, three-year action plans with specific objectives will be developed. At the end of each three-year period, progress will be evaluated, and a new set of objectives will be developed. Action items to achieve the specific objectives will be identified on an annual basis, after consideration of available resources, both human and financial. These action items will have specific performance measures to ensure progress is quantifiable. The Mayor and Council will confirm Departmental direction through the annual Capital and Operating Budget approval process.

Dividing the overall plan into shorter segments will provide the needed flexibility for a changing environment. Community review and continual feedback will provide the information needed to evaluate the continued relevancy of this document.



PARKS AND RECREATION TEN YEAR STRATEGIC SERVICE PLAN

Mission

To provide a park system offering high quality facilities, programs and services for Tucsonans of all ages and abilities.

Community Core Values

Park Accessibility Customer Service Health and Wellness Family Youth
Seniors Inclusion Recreation Equity Safety
Environmental Stewards Resource Management Disabled Population

Vision

The City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department will provide a variety of parks, recreation facilities and program experiences equitably throughout the community. Existing facilities will be aggressively maintained and additional facilities added as growth and demand dictate. Programs will be developed and maintained to the highest quality, ensuring a safe environment with exceptional service, while developing a lifetime customer. Services will demonstrate a positive economic investment through partnerships with other service providers, both public and private, ensuring a high quality of life for Tucsonans.

Strategic Directions

Connectivity Natural Resources Accessibility
Signature Parks Maximize Resources Lifetime Users

Policies and 3-year Action Plans

Annual Performance Measures

City of Tucson
Parks and Recreation Department
Ten Year Strategic Service Plan

2006 Mayor and Council

Robert E. Walkup, Mayor

Jose J. Ibarra, Ward I
Carol W. West, Ward II
Karen Uhlich, Ward III

Shirley C. Scott, Ward IV
Steve Leal, Ward V
Nina Trasoff, Ward VI

Mike Hein, City Manager
Liz R. Miller, Assistant City Manager

Parks and Recreation Commission

Steve Anderson, Chairperson, Ward IV
Jason Stewart, Mayor's Office
Bob Rodriguez, Ward I
Katie Maass, Ward II
Thomas Tronsdal, Ward III
Mark Albrecht, Ward V
Earl Cross, Ward VI

Parks and Recreation Management Team

Fred Gray, Director
Bob Martin, Deputy Director
Benny Young, Deputy Director
Mike Hayes, Deputy Director – Golf
Susan Basford, Administrator - ZARPO
Jim Conroy, Administrator – East District
Reenie Ochoa, Administrator – Southwest District
Peg Weber, Administrator – Northwest District
Luis Lara, Management Coordinator - Planning
Pat McGrath, Management Coordinator – Budget
Glenn Hicks, Project Manager

Consultant Team

Leon Younger & PROS
Planners Ink
ETC/Leisure Vision

A STARTING PLACE

“A community is enhanced by its people, parks and programs.”

In the year 2000, the City of Tucson’s Mayor, City Council, City Manager, and Director and staff of Parks and Recreation identified the need to update and refine its Parks and Recreation services and facilities for the 21st Century. Their goal was to develop a Strategic Service Plan to guide them and the Department’s efforts for the next ten years. Their hope was to engage and encourage Tucson’s citizens and leaders to articulate the community’s needs. In doing so, they helped shape a Strategic Service Plan that will continue to build strong neighborhoods and improve the quality of life in Tucson.

In developing this Strategic Service Plan, Leon Younger and PROS (Positive Revenue Outcome Strategists) incorporated all the elements of a Strategic Service Plan as it applies to organizational changes that address a community’s vision for their parks and recreation system needs.

Parks and Recreation services in the City of Tucson are at a crossroads. Historically, the system has been a quality operation that has serviced the community effectively for many years. However, keeping pace with the rapidly changing needs of the community requires a careful evaluation of both where the Department has been and where it hopes to be in the future.

As Tucson progresses into the new century, the City’s growing, aging and changing population will have new and different demands for Parks and Recreation programs and facilities. The City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department has prepared this plan to provide a framework to meet these challenges.

This Strategic Service Plan will benefit the community, elected officials, City administration and Parks and Recreation staff by providing a clear direction of where the City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department is going and how it will get there. The implementation of this plan will benefit the citizens of Tucson for many years to come.

This Strategic Service Plan is a living document that will require annual review of work accomplished and outcomes achieved. At a minimum, this plan should be updated every three years to keep pace with Tucson’s changing environment.

PURPOSE

The City of Tucson is a growing community with a diverse population. Like many rapidly growing urban areas, Tucson recognizes the importance of long-range planning to stay abreast of the needs of its citizens.

The purpose of this Strategic Service Plan is to address three primary challenges that are facing the City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department.

1. Tucson is experiencing significant changes in the diversity of its population. The population is aging and becoming more diverse. In the year 2005, the Hispanic/Latino population represented 39% of the total community. This will have a definite impact on programs and services needed.
2. Geographically, the city is expanding and the population is growing. According to the U. S. Census Bureau, in 1990 the population was 405,390. By 2000, it had grown 18.3% to 496,575 people. The population is projected to increase to 569,980 by 2010 and to 595,385 by 2013. This population growth will translate into a need for additional facilities.
3. There is a critical need to add to our existing parks and open space and to address current deficiencies and projected growth. As this study will indicate, additional open space is needed in new growth areas as well as within the established areas of the City. Even without the projected growth the City operates at a deficit in terms of facilities.

In order to meet these challenges, the strategic planning process has been driven by a community vision identified by many

sectors including the City Council, the community, City Administration and the staff of the Parks and Recreation Department.

The Parks and Recreation system is an exceptional system that carries with it a significant record of providing quality services to the community. One of the highlights of the system is Reid Park with many amenities such as the Reid Park Zoo, the Randolph Tennis Facility, Hi Corbett Stadium, the athletic fields, Randolph Recreation Center and the Golf Courses. There are also new facilities such as Clements Center, El Pueblo Center, Udall Center and Quincie Douglas Center. There is a strong aquatics program that is respected by other cities across the country. This is coupled with a history of providing excellent youth programs in areas such as KIDCO after-school/summer activities, sports and self-enrichment programs.

With a significant interest toward improving the system further, the City made the important decision to update the Parks and Recreation Master Plan to a strategic plan in order to accommodate the rapidly changing environment. There are many reasons for updating the plan. While many park additions have been made in the last decade in an effort to keep up with growth, the additions have not been sufficient in terms of number of parks and diversity of park amenities needed for the user. The Parks and Recreation Department is experiencing an aging infrastructure. Most pools were constructed in the 60s and 70s. Several programming facilities are obsolete in size and usability. Facilities that have been recently constructed are described by staff as "busting at their seams" with overuse.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

To help focus efforts and energy in the planning process, a framework for planning was adopted to encourage success. The three-step strategic and comprehensive planning process includes the following major elements:

- I. Analysis and Findings**
- II. Visioning Process**
- III. Strategic Directions**

From the beginning of the planning process, goal setting has been a critical component to ensure the success of the plan. The process can be viewed as a goal-setting, consensus-building exercise, with the desire to create strategic directions to guide future actions. Goals are written as a direct reflection of findings from the research process. They provide a fresh look at the core services of the parks and recreation system and will help define the areas where the department needs to concentrate its efforts and resources in the future. Within each strategic direction, policies, objectives and actions are written to address these goals. The actions are the steps to be taken within each goal and reflect the immediate activity that needs to be initiated to accomplish the goal and thus provide positive direction toward the future.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Thorough community research and exploration, an inventory of the entire parks and recreation system took place. The focus of all efforts in this phase was to gather as much information as possible concerning the status of existing conditions. This phase of the process helped the consultant identify the baseline for understanding how the system and organization works. In addition to the exploration of the agency, a variety of information gathering activities were initiated with key Department staff, line staff, other agency department heads, elected officials, community leaders, and recreation groups who are affiliated with the Parks and Recreation Department. The public was asked to provide input through a number of fact-gathering strategies. Finally, an analysis of the existing local market and comparable markets in selected cities across the nation was conducted to determine how the local parks and recreation services compared with those services.

Collected data were analyzed to identify strengths and weaknesses in the system; to measure the effectiveness of service delivery; and gauge the attitudes of staff, citizens, stakeholders and leaders in the community. The intent was to hear from people using a multitude of tools and strategies to encourage feedback.

Community Input

It was imperative that the plan reflected the desires of the citizens of Tucson. The community of the future is built on present day planning. To assure the voices of the residents of Tucson were heard in this process, extensive public involvement was encouraged.

Public Meetings

- A kick-off meeting was held to initiate and introduce the planning process to the staff.
- Focus groups were conducted with community and business leaders to discuss ideas and identify issues.
- Four public meetings were held for the community in September and October of 2000 to validate the identified issues and elicit more feedback. Two follow-up meetings were held in November of 2001.
- Partnership meetings were held with the agencies and businesses currently working with Tucson Parks and Recreation in operational capacities.

Surveys

The data gathered in the first phases allowed the consultants to identify key issues in the community and to develop a community-wide citizen survey, a user group survey and a golf user survey.

Review of Existing Documents

Documents of the organization were reviewed to gain an appreciation of the history and standards that were expected of the organization in the past. These studies included review of planning documents, budgets and various reports. It became clear that the broad goals of the City General Plan, the City Strategic Plan, the Livable Tucson Program and the Eastern Pima County Trail System Master Plan should be considered in the City Parks and Recreation Strategic Service Plan to maintain continuity.

Recreation Programs

Citizen and User Group Survey respondents and focus group participants were asked to comment on recreation programs. In addition, the consultant analyzed recreation programming.

Policies

Parks and Recreation Department policies were reviewed. Community comments regarding various policies were also gathered from surveys and focus groups.

Communication

Both communication within the Department and external communication between the Department and outside partner organizations were examined.

Demographic Analysis

A review of the current and future demographics characteristics of both Tucson and Pima County was completed by the City's Planning Department. With the conclusion of the Census 2000 during the planning phases of this project, population projections changed from prior information. The Census 2000 information was limited at this time, releasing only the total population and Hispanic population figures. Key findings were derived from the Tucson Update 2000, the 1999 Community Survey Profile for Tucson and Census 2000 reports.

Benchmark Analysis

In order to determine if the services that are provided to the community are adequate, it is necessary to draw comparisons with other organizations that are similar in size and geographic location. An analysis was conducted of other similar parks and

recreation systems in the southwest region of the United States to draw comparisons with Tucson's services.

Parks and recreation systems in cities of comparable size to Tucson were chosen based on exceptional performance and national recognition. Surveys were sent to administrators in the following cities: Phoenix, AZ (pop. 1,263,895), Long Beach, CA. (pop. 457,608), Tucson, AZ (pop. 485,790), Mesa, AZ (pop. 404,191), Colorado Springs, CO (pop. 351,000) and Tempe, AZ (159,220). Each municipality provided population figures prior to the release of the 2000 Census data. The following areas were compared.

- Game Fields (softball, soccer, and baseball)
- Game Courts (basketball, tennis, volleyball)
- Pools
- Recreation Centers
- Total Operating Budget
- Capital Improvement Budget
- Subsidy Rate
- Number of Employees
- Trail Miles
- Community Parks
- Regional Parks
- Neighborhood Parks

Parks and Facilities Analysis

The Parks and Facilities analysis was conducted utilizing a computer-based Geographic Information System (GIS) program. Data that were incorporated into the analysis included the City's current inventory of parks and facilities, citizen survey results, City population for 2000, projected population for 2010 and 2013, and selected populations for youth (under 18 years) and

seniors (60 years and over). Income levels and stress indicators prepared by the City of Tucson Planning Department were also mapped. Five park types were identified for the Tucson parks system based on parameters of park size, service area radius

and operational guidelines (Table 1). These parameters are based on national park standards and standards of comparable cities across the nation.

Table 1: Service Area Analysis Guidelines

| Park Guidelines | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Park Type* | Standard Park Size | Service Radius of park | Core/Mid-City Guideline | Edge/Future City Guideline | Population Type |
| Mini Park | 1 ac max | 1/4 mile | 1 ac/1,000 persons | 1 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |
| Neighborhood/School Park | 1-15 ac | 1/2 mile | 2.5 ac/1,000 persons | 2.5 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |
| Community Park | 15-40 ac | 1 mile | 3 ac/1,000 persons | 3 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |
| Metro Park | 40-200 ac | 2.5 miles | 1.5 ac/1,000 persons | 3.5 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |
| Regional Park | >200 ac | 7 miles | not applicable | 2 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |

* See Appendix F for definitions

| Facility Guidelines | | |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Facility Type | Guideline | Population Type |
| Adult Baseball (>200') | 1 field/12,000 persons | Total population |
| Youth Baseball (<200') | 1 field/10,000 persons | Youth population |
| Soccer/Football | 1 field/12,000 persons | Total & Youth population |
| Softball | 1 field/10,000 persons | Total & Youth population |
| Trails/pathways within parks | 1 mi/15,000 persons | Total & Senior population |
| Playgrounds | 1 playground/2,500 persons | Total population |
| Recreation Centers | 1 sf per person served based on size of center | Total & Senior population |
| Swimming Pools (year-round and seasonal) | Neighborhood: 1 pool/5,000 Community: 1 pool /15,000 Family Aquatic Center: 1 pool /30,000 Heated/Year-round: 1 pool /50,000 | Total population |

THE VISIONING PROCESS

The visioning process is one that depends on understanding where an organization and community has been in the past and where it chooses to go in the future. Park and recreation community visions are created through effective community involvement. The community outlined, through several input processes, what it values, what parts of the past should be included and updated in the plan, key trends it would like to see incorporated and the issues it felt were most important to address.

Communities are ever changing entities. In order to understand how a community is to change in the future it is necessary to appreciate its history and culture.

The vision that has been created by the community for the Parks and Recreation Department provides an overall direction for the future. It is important to remember that this document is dynamic and must change over time because the makeup and nature of the community is ever changing. As the culture of the community changes, adjustments will be made to the plan to address these changes.

City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Mission Statement

To provide a park system offering high quality facilities, programs and services for Tucsonans of all ages and abilities

Parks and Recreation Community Core Values

The Department developed the Vision by incorporating the community's core values that will drive the overall vision, goals and management of the parks and recreation system in the future. These community values are:

- Park Accessibility
- Customer Service
- Youth
- Inclusion
- Equity
- Safety
- Family
- Recreation
- Health and Wellness
- Resource Management
- Environmental Stewards

Vision Statement

A vision statement was created that reflected the collection of input and data from the community and the Department. The vision will drive the organization in the desired direction.

“The City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department will provide a variety of parks, recreation facilities and program experiences equitably throughout the community. Existing facilities will be aggressively maintained and additional facilities added as growth and demand dictate. Programs will be developed and maintained to the highest quality, ensuring a safe environment with exceptional service while developing a lifetime customer. Services will demonstrate a positive economic investment through partnerships with other service providers, both public and private, contributing to a high quality of life for Tucsonans.”

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

The final phase of the planning process was identifying strategic directions. Directions, objectives, and policies based on the vision and core values were summarized and prioritized with the staff. Future energies and efforts of the Department will focus on these initiatives by level of priority.

The following recommendations reflect the combined efforts of all staff involved in the planning process. As a result, this shared vision will help the organization progress to a changed environment through common goals.

The consulting team worked over twelve months actively listening to the Tucson community, collecting important data and projecting trends for the future. From this work, the Parks and Recreation Department staff and the consulting team created a plan to move the organization into the future. This movement can take place with the confidence that the community and staff have been heard and recommendations in the plan validate their input.

To achieve the vision, the Department had to identify key strategic directions that drive the overall management of the parks and recreation system. The directions that were identified are:

- Provide **CONNECTIVITY** between parks, open space and recreational facilities
- Protect **NATURAL RESOURCES**
- Provide **ACCESSIBILITY** to parks and recreation facilities
- Develop **SIGNATURE FACILITIES**
- **MAXIMIZE RESOURCES** in managing and operating parks recreation facilities and programs
- Develop **LIFETIME CUSTOMERS**

CONNECTIVITY

Goal: To develop a system of linear parks, trails and pathways that will connect parks, recreation facilities, natural resource areas, watercourses, and destination attractions to people of all ages while ensuring safe access for all.

This goal addresses the need to develop a pathway and trail system that links City and County parks. Linking these trail systems will increase ease of movement for all residents and allow them to experience various recreation opportunities throughout Tucson. This issue scored very high on the citizens' list of priorities for the future direction of the park system.

Policies

- Provide a safe, connective park system
- Provide easy access to community assets and connection of parks, facilities and natural resource areas in the community by using open space corridors and trail systems
- Improve City management systems to foster planning efforts that encourage the idea of connecting the community with trails and urban pathways.

Objectives

- Identify and acquire corridors and access locations for the development of a major trail system that connects parks, recreation facilities, natural open spaces, watercourses and destination attractions.
- Develop a Citywide trails plan by working cooperatively with the Transportation and Planning Departments, Pima County, Pima Association of Governments, Regional Transportation Authority and other cities and jurisdictions.

- Prepare for adoption of an ordinance requiring all developments to provide funds for acquisition and construction of the urban paths system for alternative mode purposes that passes through or adjacent to their property and links the system together.
- Acquire recreation easements through utility corridors for recreational purposes that support linking the urban pathway system together.
- Develop and design urban paths to meet a 12' – 14' width and support a safe experience for all levels of users.
- Equestrian trails will be accommodated by the regional river washes and natural City park areas that can serve as access and staging to the regional river washes.
- Require new developments and subdivisions to incorporate a trails element and perimeter trail system.
- Adopt a trails base map and ordinance in the Land Use Code – similar to that of the Major Streets and Routes Plan.
- Provide ½ mile coverage to areas not served by existing City parks via acquiring properties that comprise the proposed urban pathway system.
- Connect neighborhood and school parks to community parks through a pathway system that broadens the users' park experience and provides safe access to each site.
- Create connections for both on- road and off-road accessibility to parks through an effective linkage system.

- Improve coordination and communication between departments and agencies to ensure that policies and goals are included in rezoning conditions, board of adjustment cases, and other design review or development agreements.

Urban Pathways

An Urban Pathways element has been developed to provide a framework for the City to continue building an interconnected system of urban trails, greenways and open spaces. Details of this element are described in Appendix B.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Goal: To develop nature parks, natural watercourses and greenways for nature-oriented and passive recreational activities. Acquisition and protection of natural open space and restoration of disturbed open space will be a major focus for the Department during this planning period.

There is a critical demand to incorporate open space for parks. Additional open space is needed in new growth areas as well as within the established areas of the City. This goal addresses the need for providing natural open space within the City that includes natural resource parks, natural areas within parks, washes and greenways.

Policies

- Balance active and passive recreation spaces and parks
- Provide open space connections between parks, facilities and natural resource areas in the community
- Focus on future regional park acquisition that will showcase the region's natural setting, beauty and topography
- Provide abundant green space for a protected desert environment
- Identify, enhance, provide and protect opportunities for the community to observe wildlife in the park system
- Protect urban wildlife and habitat.
- Develop an environmental education program that promotes the knowledge and appreciation of urban wildlife and their habitats

Objectives

- Establish a regional natural resource technical advisory committee to seek outside expertise in managing sensitive areas of existing and future parks in the system.
- Metro parks will be designed to recognize the natural spaces within the park area that are available and treat these areas in a sensitive manner.
- Develop a wildlife management plan for the park system.
- Develop a landscape design guideline that enhances opportunities to attract and view urban wildlife.
- Add a planner for rezoning, pre-submittal and development reviews.

Natural Resource Management

Natural Resource Management recommendations have been further developed and detailed in Appendix C.

ACCESSIBILITY

Goal: To create equity of access for all citizens by ensuring a park will be accessible within a ¼ mile (9-block) radius for active (programmed) or passive (self-directed) space.

This goal addresses the equity issue present in the City where there is a lack of both active and passive parks for residents in some neighborhoods.

Policies

- Create a system that supports equitable community access physically, economically, and socially to all parks, programs and facilities managed and operated by the City
- Give higher priority to land acquisition practices
- Incorporate facility standards and City of Tucson equity maps to back-fill areas where park space is minimal and when considering new park growth
- Incorporate regional parks with outdoor recreation centers, trail connections and sports facilities as needed to satisfy the goal of appropriate acres per 1,000 residents
- Develop a program strategy to identify and begin to fill the gaps that exist in service delivery of recreation programs
- Standardize criteria for regional, metro, community, and neighborhood parks, programs and centers
- Initiate field to user equity programs for boys and girls sports throughout the City
- Increase ways to further improve services to the disabled
- Increase patronage of special use facilities

- Mini-parks will not be constructed when under one acre in size unless needed to accommodate recreation or open space ¼ mile access (3 block) demand which cannot be met by a neighborhood park, a school park or a special use park area.

Objectives

- **Neighborhood parks;** Provide park coverage within a 1/2-mile radius via existing City parks and other publicly owned property. To achieve the City's open space goals (7 acres per 1,000 residents in the core and mid-City areas and 11 acres per 1,000 residents in edge and future City areas of the City), the City must provide a ¾ mile radius coverage to areas not served by existing parks via joint use agreements with schools, colleges and universities and other City or County-owned property.
- Seek creative measures to acquire land for development of appropriate park sites within areas of Tucson that are missing parks and other open public spaces.
- **Community parks;** Re-evaluate the design criteria for community parks to support a balance of active and passive spaces and design parks to accommodate what the park needs to accomplish for the community.
- The City will acquire and develop new community parks in under served areas.

- **Metro parks;** Design metro parks to include sports facilities that support league and tournament play for both youth and adults.
- **Regional parks;** Acquire space for additional regional parks in southeast Tucson to meet the future open space needs of Tucson and include an outdoor recreation center, trail connections and sports fields as needed to satisfy the goal of appropriate acres per 1,000 residents
- Provide ½ mile coverage to areas not served by existing City parks via acquiring properties that comprise the proposed urban pathway system.
- Strengthen the relationship with the Bicycle Transportation Committee. The City will work jointly with the Bicycle Transportation Committee in developing future neighborhood park sites to help meet the needs for a neighborhood park and access to public bicycle community.
- The City will develop a park ordinance for developer impact fees and other available methods of cost recovery for park development purposes that supports the guidelines for park acreage per 1,000 residents. The ordinance will be coordinated with the City Planning Department and with Element 12, Cost of Development, of the City's General Plan.
- Neighborhood Parks will be designed or redesigned to meet neighborhood demographic and diversity needs and link to community parks for broader recreation experiences.
- Connect neighborhood and school parks to community parks through a magnet link pathway system that broadens the users' park experience and provides safe access to each site.
- Community parks will be designed with the type of amenities to support the diversity of users, demographics and recreation users' needs that are served by the park.
- The City will convert under-utilized recreation amenities in parks to meet the neighborhood needs for other new recreation amenities.

Parks and Facilities Plan

A comprehensive Parks and Facilities Analysis was conducted and guidelines for future development of parks and facilities were determined. The estimated costs of additional parks and facilities required to meet the guidelines were also developed. The recommended Parks and Facilities Plan is detailed in Appendix D.

Park Classifications

See Appendix F for more detailed explanations of park classifications.

SIGNATURE PARKS

Goal: *To develop and maintain signature parks that provide a variety of recreation experiences in one location maximizing the cost benefit of the investment and framing the City's image of livability.*

The Department should be a prime catalyst for sustaining Tucson's sense of livability. It is poised to do so by managing well-maintained and recognizable open spaces and recreation facilities. By creating a balance of active and passive park environs with appropriately placed amenities this goal can be achieved.

Policies

- Design parks by considering neighborhood demographic and diversity needs so broader recreation experiences are met
- Incorporate Regional parks with outdoor recreation centers, trail connections and sports facilities as needed to satisfy the goal of appropriate acres per 1,000 residents
- Schedule infrastructure maintenance yearly to upgrade the complete park system over a set period of time to ensure a quality park system for future generations
- Establish and maintain a series of signature parks to raise the value and appreciation of parks Citywide
- Create a comprehensive preventative maintenance plan for all parks and recreation facilities in the system and update maintenance standards for parks and recreation facilities in the system

Objectives

- The City will establish and maintain a series of signature parks to raise the value and appreciation of parks.

- Create and implement policies and procedures for a comprehensive preventative maintenance program for all parks and recreation facilities.
- Develop an urban resource management plan with the Transportation and Planning Departments that focuses on population density needs, redevelopment and economic development.
- Update written maintenance standards for each park and recreation facility in the system to provide consistency.
- Develop and update an asset management plan to track and maintain asset lifecycles throughout the system. Ensure appropriate levels of capital monies are available to extend the asset life of parks and recreation facilities as long as possible.
- Develop "signature art" in designated signature parks to promote the values of the region.

MAXIMIZE RESOURCES

Goal: To maximize all available resources in operating and maintaining parks and recreation programs, utilizing creativity that incorporates partnerships, key trends, efficiency and acceptable funding sources.

Maximizing the Department's resources through effective management options as it applies to partnerships is essential. The Department must become more performance based by considering the cost per experience, capacity of use, customer satisfaction and resource management. This will ensure the opportunity to explore new funding options, more entrepreneurial thinking and higher levels of accountability and responsibility.

Policies

- Determine ways to stimulate funding and resource growth of the parks and recreation system with projected new community development through creative partnership with developers
- Examine under-utilized recreation amenities and recreate them to meet the current neighborhood needs
- Establish a golf capital improvement plan to address needs on existing courses and other community development opportunities in existing golf courses to increase the revenue levels at each course
- Initiate future planning that will be performance-based
- Implement a program that will effectively address the needs of the internal and external customer
- Identify technology needs within the Department and devising a plan to meet those needs
- Define ways to streamline management and decision systems for greater efficiency

- Improve revenue production through creative budgeting and revenue strategies
- Create training programs to leverage against the projected retirement of key administrative staff in the future
- Determine Core Programs that are offered by the Department
- Initiate activity based costing models in selected programs and facilities
- Develop mini-marketing plans for each core program area and recreation facility to maximize capacity, meet customer needs, and achieve minimum revenues to offset expenses
- Initiate a schedule of fees that will help in the recovery of costs incurred for the delivery of aquatic programs and services

Objectives

- The Department will identify its internal customers and establish standards for communication, systems control and measurable objectives that support users' needs.
- The Department will develop a technology master plan that will evaluate what access is needed for the Department, what equipment and software needs to be upgraded and staff training that should be done to improve use of technology.
- A system wide marketing plan will be developed with an organized approach to image management, publications

and flyers. A customer feedback program for all service areas will be implemented.

- The Department will develop a management approach to matrix coordination within the new organization to push decision-making down to the lowest level in the organization to move the delivery of services in a faster, more efficient manner.
- Develop measurable outcomes of results on decentralization in regards to services, standards, use of resources and efficiency.
- Develop an on-going internal training program for the next three years to bring new leaders into the organization's decision-making role to transition key staff that will be retiring from the system.
- A Pricing Policy will be developed to achieve appropriate earned income funding targets.
- The department will develop a professional fund development ethics program that reflects the values of the community as it applies to the development of services.
- The department will develop a unified approach to employee development and improve staff relationships by building teamwork and unity into the organization's culture.

Operational Recommendations

The consultant team conducted an extensive review of the Parks and Recreation Department organization, policies and procedures. Recommendations were developed to improve organizational efficiency and to prepare the Department for the implementation of the Strategic Plan. These recommendations are detailed in Appendix E.

LIFETIME CUSTOMERS

Goal: To establish recreation services for all citizens that encourage lifetime users in core recreation services targeted to youth, teens, adults, families and community-wide events.

This goal addresses the need to define what program services are appropriate for the City to provide. The Department has performed well in the past; however, resources are at their operational limits. The City must determine whether it has the resources and capabilities to be all things to all people. Ideally, the goal of the Department is to build lifetime customers through effective and targeted programs, creating opportunities for all residents in the community to connect with the Department, not just a select group who feel they are entitled to the services.

Policies

- Design services by considering neighborhood demographic and diversity needs so broader recreation experiences are met
- Determine Core Programs that are to be offered by the Department
- Develop a program strategy to identify and begin to serve the gaps that exist in service delivery of recreation programs
- Consider program lifecycles to ensure program disconnects are reduced
- Improve visitor experience satisfaction at the golf courses

Objectives

- Determine core and non-core programs. Determine market position for all recreation programs.
- Develop a recreation program strategy to serve gaps in service delivery as it relates to the City's core recreation programs.

- Establish a level of tax support for each core recreation program based on true cost that includes both direct and indirect cost.
- Each core recreation program established will develop consistent operational standards that support the outcomes to be achieved.
- Centers will be classified as regional, metro, community, neighborhood, or program based on square footage, individuals served, programs provided and hours of operation.
- Equitable access to recreation centers and pools will be available based on square footage standards to population.
- Core program services will be established for each recreation facility based on the demographics of the area served, density levels and needs.
- Create more recreation facilities that are suitable for all ages both indoor and outdoor.
- Develop a strategy to provide softball, baseball and soccer facilities for all youth and adults in the City based on need

Strategic Directions – Lifetime Customers

as outlined in the facility requirements of the Strategic Service Plan.

- Initiate a field to user ratio of people registered to ensure field equity for boys and girls sports throughout the City.
- Initiate a field lighting user strategy for youth sports based on the number of youth registered versus entitlement.
- Advocate for more game and practice fields based on demand of lifetime users.
- Develop age segment programs that connect one age group to the next so there are no disconnects in service.
- Establish consistent standards on classification of senior services as it applies to program access and discounts throughout the department.
- Partner with other service providers for people with disabilities to increase recreation opportunities.
- Develop indoor and outdoor facilities to create equal access for people with disabilities to pursue lifetime use.
- Provide recreation opportunities for persons with disabilities to experience current trends in leisure activities focusing on competitive sports, high adventure activities and lifetime skill classes.
- Provide opportunities to serve persons with disabilities in under-served areas of the community.
- **Zoo:** Increase public awareness of the Zoo through effective outreach programs, radio and newspaper coverage, targeted marketing and public relations efforts.
- Develop and maintain the highest level of safety standards for visitors, animals and staff.
- The zoo will incorporate best practices and innovative techniques to drive attendance and increase length of visitor stay.
- The zoo will demonstrate a conservation ethic by implementing reduce, reuse and recycle practices in all tasks associated with the zoo.
- The zoo will augment paid staff through increased numbers of effective volunteers.
- **Golf:** Maintain the golf courses to the highest affordable standard as it relates to grounds and facilities.
- Implement an effective customer service feedback program for all types of golfers utilizing user surveys, focus groups, trailer calls and on-site evaluations.
- Maintain a high level of user base on all golf courses through effective customer service, pricing, program development and maintenance standards.
- Price golf services to the benefits received to achieve self-supporting status with no tax subsidy for operations, maintenance and capital equipment costs.
- **Marketing:** Develop specific mini-marketing plans for each core program area and recreation facility to maximize capacity, meet customer needs and achieve minimum revenues to offset expenses.
- Develop a business-marketing plan for each revenue center throughout the department.
- The department staff will develop a continuous improvement process to evaluate programs, facilities and maintenance from a user's perspective.
- **Aquatics Programs:** Initiate a schedule of fees that will help in the recovery of costs incurred for the delivery of aquatic programs and services.
- Consider a rate structure for all non-lesson activities that have the potential for generating revenue.
- Determine how to make the lesson experience more rewarding for the parent.

Strategic Directions – Lifetime Customers

- Determine ways to enhance the pool experience in traditional flat-water pools.
- Review ways to incorporate a fee schedule for aquatic programs.
- **Aquatics Management:** Define a desired management structure for the aquatics operations.
- Identify new pool schedules that are based on frequency of use in the community.
- Create analysis tools to measure performance of pools and use as a device to aid future pool decision-making and ensure accountability at pools.
- **Aquatics Facilities:** Identify the level of service that needs to be offered at each pool.
- Create a new water park in the City as a model for future pool development.
- **Aquatics Staffing:** From the Levels of Service analysis determine the number of aquatics pool supervisor positions that are needed in the future.
- From the Levels of Service analysis determine the number of aquatics pool leadership (guard) positions that are needed in the future.
- From the Levels of Service analysis determine the number of pool support staff positions that are needed in the future.
- Determine ways to incorporate a Jr. Guard program to reduce the costs of operating pools and increasing the number of future pool employees.
- **Aquatics Marketing:** Organize informational data from several available sources that have been identified in this strategic service plan process (facilities, participation, and programs) into forms of communication to set up the proposed plan.
- Create a program that allows the pools and associated programs to be more readily identified in the community.
- **Tennis Programs:** Establish performance standards for activities such as lessons, leagues and tournaments to understand how many people use the facility
- Explore ways to build facility use.
- Determine ways to communicate the values of tennis and the economic impact it has on community tourism.
- Determine ways to improve the revenue distribution between the tennis facility and the Parks and Recreation Department.
- **Tennis Operations Management:**
- Define a desired management structure for the future tennis operations.
- Determine the standards of maintenance that will be desired for each Level of Service. Levels of Service can be classified as:
 - Level 1, drop in neighborhood facility with one or two courts;
 - Level 2, four to eight courts that are lighted where lessons, events can be held;
 - Level 3, court complexes that are lighted and suitable for tournament play;
 - Level 4, private sector facilities
- Determine incremental operational costs of each level of service that would be considered a "Cost for Doing Business" in the tennis operations.
- Re-evaluate existing facilities for use to determine if those facilities that have attained useful obsolescence can be converted to another function.
- **Tennis Capital Recommendation:** Inventory existing tennis facilities in the community to determine location, number of courts, quality of courts and the amount of use by the tennis community.
- Assess the condition of all existing courts in the City of Tucson to determine the Level of Service.

Strategic Directions – Lifetime Customers

- Determine if there is projected residential development in areas where the gaps exist.
- Create a matrix of courts that exist in the community and prioritize the time of repair or replacement of Tennis, Racquetball and Handball courts.
- Determine if courts that are located on park or school property need to be taken out of service.
- **Tennis Marketing:** Organize informational data from several studies that have been completed in this strategic planning process (facility, participation, and program) into forms of communication to set up the proposed plan.
- Create a Marketing Plan that incorporates various forms of strategies (the five P's people, place, product, promotion, and price) to communicate tennis to the community.
- Determine funding for tennis niche marketing.
- Create a seasonal marketing strategy for tennis programs and facilities.
- Determine distribution of the market pieces that have been created.
- Incorporate how tennis will "play in" with the overall Park and Recreation Themes program.
- Design systems that track the results of all marketing efforts.
- Explore the potential of how foundation functions can be implemented to generate new revenues.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This was a process whereby thorough community research and exploration of the entire parks and recreation system took place. The focus of all efforts in this phase was to gather as much information as possible concerning the status of existing conditions. This phase of the process helped the consultant identify the baseline for understanding how the system and organization works. In addition to the exploration of the agency, a variety of information gathering activities were initiated with key Department staff, line staff, other agency department heads, elected officials, community leaders, and recreation groups who are affiliated with the Parks and Recreation Department. The public was asked to provide input through a number of fact-gathering strategies. Finally, an analysis of the existing local market and comparable markets in selected cities across the nation was conducted to determine how the local parks and recreation services compared with those services.

Collected data was analyzed to identify strengths and weaknesses in the system; to measure the effectiveness of service delivery; and gauge the attitudes of staff, citizens, stakeholders and leaders in the community. The intent was to hear from people using a multitude of tools and strategies to encourage feedback.

Community Input

It was imperative that the plan reflected the desires of the citizens of Tucson. The community of the future is built on present day planning. To assure the voices of the residents of Tucson were heard in this process, extensive public involvement was encouraged.

Public Meetings

- A kick-off meeting was held to initiate and introduce the planning process to the staff.
- Focus groups were conducted with community and business leaders to discuss ideas and identify issues.
- Four public meetings were held for the community in September and October of 2000 to validate the identified issues and elicit more feedback. Two follow-up meetings were held in November of 2001.
- Partnership meetings were held with the agencies and businesses currently working with Tucson Parks and Recreation in operational capacities.

Findings

Key issues were identified and included in the community-wide citizen survey. The issues centered on these prevalent themes:

- Equitable access to Parks and Recreation facilities for all citizens of Tucson
- A higher priority of land acquisition practices
- A balance of active and passive recreation spaces and parks
- Funding to support the necessary operations and resources in order to meet the demands of the citizens
- Preventative maintenance schedules that are proactive
- Prioritization of the renovations of existing infrastructure

Surveys

The data gathered in this first phase allowed the consultants to identify key issues in the community and to develop a

community-wide citizen survey, a user groups survey and a golf user survey.

The citizen survey was mailed to 3,600 households in Tucson and surrounding areas in Pima County. A total of 1,313 surveys were either returned or completed in follow-up phone call interviews.

The User Groups Survey was mailed to 100 randomly selected organizations to assess usage of facilities, satisfaction with services provided, and the need for improvements.

The golf survey was administered to 411 randomly selected golfers at the City courses. They were asked to evaluate conditions, customer service, operations and pricing tolerances.

Findings

- Only one-third of the households surveyed had participated in programs.
- Awareness of programs provided by the City of Tucson Parks and Recreation was very high.
- Most rated the quality of the programs as “good” to “excellent”.
- The household survey respondents indicated that the most important programs were concerts, special events and adult fitness and health-related programs.
- More than half of the respondents believe the City should support improvements to the parks and facilities.
- The organizations that used the facilities were satisfied with the availability of dates and times.
- The facilities were considered very clean.
- Most organizations did not have a written agreement with the City.

- The golf courses were favorably rated in comparison to other courses in Tucson.
- Customer services at the City’s courses were comparable to the other courses in Tucson and Pima County.
- The condition of the greens and fairways were the most important qualities to the golfers.

Review of Existing Documents

Documents of the organization were reviewed to gain an appreciation of the history and standards that were expected of the organization in the past. These studies included review of planning documents, budgets and various reports.

Findings

- Departmental planning in the past was primarily focused on land and facilities with very little analysis of recreation program services and management.
- The broad goals of the City General Plan, the City Strategic Plan, the Livable Tucson Program and the Eastern Pima County Trail System Master Plan should be considered in the City Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan to maintain continuity.

Recreation Programs

Citizen and User Group Survey respondents and focus group participants were asked to comment on recreation programs. In addition, the consultant analyzed recreation programming.

Findings

- There is a desire to increase the parks and recreation programs in a variety of areas that would positively impact all segments of the community. Overall, there is an articulated

need to increase programs to specific age groups and tailor them to meet needs based on population density and age segment needs.

- Written standards have not been developed for recreation programs that will ensure equitable quality across the City.
- A lack of consistent equity in promoting programs exists. Issues with the publisher regarding the program brochure should be addressed. Changing the production has caused many problems for the staff and more importantly, the public.
- The planning sequence with internal and external participant registration needs to be reviewed due to the customers' dissatisfaction with the registration process.
- Staff are unable to offer additional programs due to the lack of space in the program brochure.
- The lack of program facility space accounts for long waiting lists of people wanting to enroll in classes and an undue number of complaint calls to elected officials.
- There is a need to increase facility space at Clements, El Pueblo, Udall, and Randolph Centers, which are absorbing participation from other parts of the community.

Policies

Parks and Recreation Department policies were reviewed. Community comments regarding various policies were also gathered from surveys and focus groups.

Findings

- Partnership opportunities should be explored.
- There are a number of partnering opportunities available to the department that should be maximized to meet program services demands.
- Existing partnerships should be reviewed to ensure they are equitable for all parties involved.

- Some focus group participants suggested that all pools be open on weekends and closed one day during the week.
- The Tucson Parks and Recreation Strategic Service Plan needs to include steps toward an "all inclusive" department for people with disabilities.
- A fees and charges policy needs to be communicated with all programming staff in the organization to gain a clear understanding of direct and indirect costs and how to effectively price services.
- Current pricing and fees for classes do not include both direct and indirect costs.
- Formulas for establishing program pricing are not subjective to each program area and are not based on the level of benefits received.
- While many staff and some community leaders feel there is a need for free and highly subsidized programs in the City, it appears there is a desire for the organization to move toward fee based programs to fund a shrinking Parks and Recreation budget.
- Half of the community surveyed was either very or somewhat supportive of charging non-residents more than residents to participate in and use City parks, facilities and recreation programs.
- There is an interest in increasing the Parks and Recreation budget to help provide more programs and opportunities for the community.

Communication

Both communication within the Department and external communication between the Department and outside partner organizations were examined.

Findings


- Communication and cooperation between the Parks and Recreation Department and other organizations in the City needs to be improved.
- Parks and Recreation staff should improve relationships with the internal and external customer. Internal customers are all full and part-time employees and volunteers. External customers are users of the services.
- The following comments were made prior to the Waters Classification and Compensation Plan. Staff is frustrated with the job classification and compensation system as it is currently established. There appears to be inequitable worker performance standards, which concerns many personnel. Job descriptions vary widely and are too vague based on their level of expectations for each employee.
- Marketing efforts should be improved in the Parks and Recreation Department.
- Program descriptions in the guide are minimal. It is difficult to explain the features or benefits of the programs in the limited space provided.

Demographic Analysis

A review of the current and future demographic characteristics of both Tucson and Pima County was completed by the City's Planning Department. With the conclusion of the Census 2000 during the planning phases of this project, population projections changed from prior information. The Census 2000 information is limited at this time, releasing only the total population and Hispanic population figures. From the Tucson Update 2000, the 1999 Community Survey Profile for Tucson and Census 2000 reports, the following are the key findings.

Findings

- Tucson was the 30th largest U.S. City in the year 2000 and Pima County was the 53rd largest county in 2000. The 2000 population estimate for Pima County is 865,145 and for Tucson, 496,575. Tucson's population is 57.4% of the entire county.
- It is projected that by the year 2010, the population will be at 569,980 for the city of Tucson and 1,053,000 for Pima County. The population for the City is projected to increase to 595,385 by 2013.
- Tucson is a fast growing City. It was ranked 23rd in absolute change from 1990-2000. Only five cities larger than Tucson grew more rapidly in percent change and only fifteen in absolute change.
- The median age was at 35.2 in 1999 due to the aging of baby boomers, which are the largest age group in the country.
- According to the 1999 American Community Survey Profile for Tucson, approximately 31% of the City's population spoke a language other than English. Of the total population five years and over, about 21% indicated that they speak English less than "very well".
- The Tucson Update 2001 reported that the per capita income is projected to be \$25,392 for the year 2001.
- Of the total households in the 1999 Community Survey Profile, the largest percentage of household incomes were in the \$15,000-\$24,999 range at 19% followed by \$25,000-\$34,999 at about 17%.
- The racial makeup of the City of Tucson is diverse. The following chart displays the racial breakdown in 2001.



Benchmark Analysis

In order to determine if the services that are provided to the community are adequate, it is necessary to draw comparisons with other organizations that are similar in size and geographic location. An analysis was conducted of other similar parks and recreation systems in the southwest region of the United States to draw comparisons with Tucson's services.

Parks and recreation systems in cities of comparable size to Tucson were chosen based on exceptional performance and national recognition. Surveys were sent to administrators in the following cities: Phoenix, AZ (pop. 1,263,895), Long Beach, CA. (pop. 457,608), Tucson, AZ (pop. 485,790), Mesa, AZ (pop. 404,191), Colorado Springs, CO (pop. 351,000) and Tempe, AZ (159,220). Each municipality provided the population figures prior to the release of the 2000 Census data. The following is representative of trends that have been derived from the analysis.

Game Fields (softball, soccer, and baseball)

The City of Tucson has 151 game fields, which ranks second in the number of fields. When comparing per capita ratio, Colorado

Springs ranks first with 53 fields per 100,000 people. Tucson ranks third out of six with 31.08 fields per 100,000 people.

Game Courts (basketball, tennis, volleyball)

Tucson has 213 game courts, which ranks second to Phoenix with 231 courts. Based on per capita, Tempe is first with 92.34 courts per 100,000 people. Tucson ranks third with 43.86 courts per 100,000 people.

Pools

Tucson does not have any indoor pools. Of the remaining cities, Long Beach ranks first with one indoor pool per 152,536 people. However, Tucson ranks first in outdoor pools with one pool per 19,432 people. Long Beach ranks last for outdoor pools with one pool per 457,608 people.

Recreation Centers

Tucson currently has 16 recreation centers. Based on per capita calculations, Phoenix ranks first with one center per 9,722 people. Tucson ranks third with one center per 30,362.

Total Operating Budget

Tucson's \$38.8 million operating budget ranks third out of six when comparing these cities. Long Beach (\$42 million) was the highest and Colorado Springs (\$14.3 million) was the lowest. However, when compared to per capita investment, Tucson ranks third (\$79.87), Tempe is first (\$103.63) and Colorado Springs is last (\$40.74).

Capital Improvement Budget

The average capital improvement budget in a year was derived by dividing the total number of CIP dollars allocated over the length of the plan by the number of years of the plan. Tucson's \$11.1 million a year ranks second only to Phoenix's \$30 million a

year in capital improvement plans. Tucson ranks fourth in per capital investment per person (\$13.73), Phoenix is highest (\$39.56) and Long Beach is lowest (\$9.55).

Subsidy Rate

Tucson's 90% subsidy rate ranks highest for the cities compared. Phoenix is second at 88% and Mesa is lowest at 74%. Benchmark cities studied do not meet the national subsidy levels of 50-65%.

Number of Employees

Tucson ranks second with 882 total employees. Only Phoenix (1,430) is higher, Tempe (207) is the lowest. Tucson ranks second in park staff (272) and fifth in program staff (146.5). When comparing per capita for each City, Colorado Springs ranks first with one fulltime staff per 525 people. Tucson ranks second with one staff for 551 people.

Trail Miles

Tucson and Long Beach do not have trails. Of the remaining cities that have trails, Phoenix is first with one mile per 1,681 people and Colorado Springs is last with one mile per 5,400 when comparing miles per capita. Phoenix has 752 miles of trails and Colorado Springs has 65 miles of trails.

Community Parks

Tucson has a total of 16 community parks and ranks fourth with one acre per 967 people. Tempe ranks first with one acre per 303 people.

Regional Parks

Tucson has a total of two regional parks and ranks last with one acre per 785 people. Colorado Springs has a total of eight

regional parks with over 7,000 acres. They rank first with one acre per 47 people.

Neighborhood Parks

Tucson has a total of 56 neighborhood parks and ranks last with one acre per 1,998 people. Colorado Springs has 116 neighborhood parks totaling over 800 acres. They rank first on a per capita basis of one acre per 435 people.

Parks and Facilities Analysis

The Parks and Facilities analysis utilized a computer-based Geographic Information System (GIS) program. Data that was incorporated into the program included the City's current inventory of parks and facilities, citizen survey results, City population for 2000, projected population for 2010, and selected populations for youth (under 18 years) and seniors (60 years and over). Income levels and stress indicators prepared by the City of Tucson Planning Department were also mapped. Five park types were identified for the Tucson parks system based on parameters of park size, service area radius and operational guidelines. These parameters are based on national park standards and standards of comparable cities across the nation and the stated needs of the community.

For the parks analysis, two different guidelines were used for different areas of the City: 1) Core/Mid-City guidelines 2) Edge/future City guidelines. Using the City of Tucson Planning Department Development Areas as a base, these guidelines were established to reflect the difference in population density, land availability, and overall build-out of different areas.

URBAN PATHWAY SYSTEM

The goal of the urban pathways element of the Parks and Recreation Ten Year Strategic Service Plan is to provide the framework for the City to continue building an interconnected system of urban trails, greenways and open spaces. The City has developed and will continue to upgrade various neighborhood, community, metro and regional parks to signature status. The initial phase of the urban pathways element will begin to connect these signature parks.

The network will build on current fragmented segments of watercourses within the City, identify bicycle pathways that include pedestrian walkways, and equestrian access ramps and connect to the developed perimeter Pima County River Parks. By establishing destinations and connections, this pathway element identifies critical linkages within the first phase needed to create the contiguous network of parks and open space within the City. As the population shifts, community needs and demands will shift the priorities for development of the network. But the overall goal for the urban pathways is to provide connections between all parks and recreation destinations, neighborhood, community, metro and regional parks.

The Pathway System

Based on the strategic policies for this vision strategy, the continuity of the network system is partially dependent on the effectiveness of the Trails Coordinator to interface with other City departments (i.e., Transportation and Planning Departments), Pima County Natural Resources, Parks & Recreation, community neighborhood groups and special interest groups. As the trails system begins to take shape, the Coordinator may find

these guidelines to be insufficient and may need to further elaborate or change these recommendations. In some instances, there may be interdepartmental or inter-jurisdictional inconsistencies that create barriers in developing pedestrian alternate modes pathways. These inconsistencies should be systematically revised to reflect the policies and goals of the Strategic Service Plan.

Cost Estimate

The estimated costs (Table 2) are calculated for each classification identified and for the approximated linear miles as calculated on the map. The total cost envisioned for the development of the spine network does not include potential land acquisition. The trails system also includes areas outside of the City's jurisdiction, but critical for providing the necessary linkages. These areas will require inter-jurisdictional cooperation and agreements.

There are approximately 140 linear miles to be built or improved. One hundred and three miles are within the City of Tucson. Of the 103 miles, 31 miles are part of Pima County's River Park System and thus outside the jurisdictional control of the City of Tucson. Mutual agreement and cooperation should be established.

The majority of Pima County trails are located in the southern portion of the mapped area. These trails were included as they are critical linkages to the regional system and are near or within City-annexed areas.

Estimated total cost of trails to be constructed within City of Tucson's jurisdiction is approximately \$9.4 million. The most costly pathway to construct is the Divided Urban Pathway. New development along Houghton Road will include this design. Most of these pathways can be constructed within roadway or drainage way rights-of-way and acquisition of property will not be necessary. There must be coordination between respective Departments (e.g., Planning, Transportation).

The urban pathway system is largely within the urban central City area. In these areas, there may be areas where property acquisition is necessary to provide contiguous linkages. These recommendations have not estimated land acquisition costs, but do recommend working closely with the City's Real Estate Division to identify fair market value of needed land.

Appendix B – Urban Pathway System

Table 2: Linear Pathway Cost Estimate (\$,000)

| Classification | Unit Cost | COT Miles | Subtotal Cost | Pima Co. Miles | Subtotal Cost | Total Miles | Total Cost |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| River Park | \$135 | 17 | \$2,295 | 5 | \$675 | 22 | \$2,970 |
| Divided Pathway | \$125 | 20 | \$2,500 | 17 | \$2,125 | 37 | \$4,625 |
| Urban Pathway | \$115 | 18 | \$2,070 | 3 | \$345 | 21 | \$2,415 |
| Urban Trail | \$42 | 25 | \$1,050 | 12 | \$504 | 37 | \$1,554 |
| Enhanced Sidewalk | \$65 | 23 | \$1,495 | 0 | \$0 | 23 | \$1,495 |
| TOTAL | | 103 | \$9,410 | 37 | \$3,649 | 140 | \$13,059 |

Phasing

The phasing plan has been developed with the goal to connect signature parks within the Core/Mid-City area where population densities are greater. The Edge/Future City area is currently developing and has a lesser number of destination parks or facilities. But as these areas are developing and as Parks and Recreation expansions, it is vital that coordination takes place to accommodate future trails rights-of-ways in development and roadway plan submittals. Timing of this phasing recommendation would follow the same years as the Strategic Service Plan phasing. Thus, these additional dollars would be added to the facilities improvement costs

Phase 1

The City of Tucson, Transportation Department has developed over 10 miles of a multi-use pathway, classified in this report as Urban Pathway, primarily signed as a bicycle route. This includes the trail paralleling Golf Links Road, the Barazza-

Aviation Freeway, and Old Spanish Trail. At the western end, this trail can utilize the downtown pedestrian and roadway system to link to Rio Nuevo South. The Old Spanish Trail Bicycle and Pedestrian Path is presently being widened from 8' to 12' in phases, and will eventually be extended from the main gate of Saguaro National Park through the Rincon Valley to Colossal Cave Mountain Park.

There remains approximately eight miles of Urban Pathway to be developed in the Core/Mid-City area. Three miles of the Urban Pathway will provide a continuous link from the Golf Links pathway to Lincoln Park and then to the future Pantano Park System. Another three miles along Arroyo Chico will connect Reid Park to the Broadway Corridor and then through Downtown to Rio Nuevo South. The remaining two miles would be at the west-central part of town to connect Kennedy Park to the Santa Cruz River Park System.

Appendix B – Urban Pathway System

Within the City's jurisdiction, most of the trails proposed in the Core/Mid-City area fall within the Enhanced Sidewalk classification, totaling 18 miles. Building on the Mountain Avenue, bicycle system, a north-south connection would link Rillito River Park with the future 5th/6th Street Corridor improvements. Continuing southward, paralleling Kino Boulevard, connections can be made with the Barazza-Aviation pathway and Pima County's Diversion Channel pathway system. This master plan also recommends interfacing with the 5th/6th Street Livability Study, to incorporate an enhanced sidewalk along this corridor. This would provide easy access to Himmel Park, and potential future extension of Alamo Wash Urban Trail. The remaining enhanced sidewalk is within Rita Ranch and develops the connection to the future Houghton Road Divided Urban Pathway.

Development of the Pantano Park is in its 1st Phase. The Master Plan is underway and letters to landowners requesting land donations have been sent.

Phase 2

Continuing with the concept of completing the Core/Mid-City region, the second phase would include needed acquisition and completion of the Alamo Wash Urban Trail connecting it to the Rillito River Park. The southern portion would be a small segment of approximately six miles. This will connect area residents to the Rillito Park and the greater regional outer loop River Park System. The Pantano Riverpark will enter the 2nd Phase when funding become available for design and construction.

Phase 3

As the east corridor becomes a prime development area within the City of Tucson, continued development of the Houghton Road Greenway Divided Urban Pathway system will become more important. In some cases, there is the opportunity to require developers to contribute toward construction of this pathway. As the residential developments get built-out in the region, residents in the Rita Ranch development will become connected to the larger regional pathways system and the facilities provided by the City Parks and Recreation.

The phasing plan recommended above, follows a development plan based on the concentration and needs of the current population. The City of Tucson has not had a comprehensive pathways plan. Pathways utilizing alternate modes of transportation (i.e., bicycles) continue to be developed by the Transportation Dept. This Pathways Plan is intended to provide more than bikeways.

The basic goals are to provide service to the current residents within the City of Tucson, develop the Core/Mid-City area and move outward to the Edge/Future City areas. But as development begins to occur in the Edge/Future City areas, the implementation of these recommendations is flexible enough to allow those opportunities to be incorporated, as they become available.

Appendix B – Urban Pathway System

Table 3: Linear Pathway Phasing (miles)


| Phase | River Park | Divided Urban pathway | Urban Pathway | Urban Trail | Enhanced Sidewalk | Total COT Miles | Total Cost (\$,000) |
|--------------|------------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Phase 1 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 23 | 55 | \$4,655 |
| Phase 2 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 32 | \$2,755 |
| Phase 3 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 16 | \$2,000 |
| Total | 17 | 20 | 18 | 25 | 23 | 103 | \$9,410 |

Trail Classifications

There needs to be a balance between the integrated system of recreational trails that connects parks, open spaces, schools and other activity centers and natural trails, watercourses and the development of man-made or urban pathway connections. Incorporating Pima County's existing River Park system and Trails Master Plan, the following proposed multi-use trail system addresses the goals and recreational needs of current and future residents of Tucson. It is essential for the City to coordinate trails planning, implementation, and management efforts interdepartmentally and with surrounding jurisdictions (i.e. Pima County, National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service and Pima Association of Governments) to ensure a cohesive and user-friendly trail network.

The Urban Pathways element of the Tucson Parks and Recreation Strategic Service Plan creates a classification system depicting the character and diversity of the trails system in Tucson. The following classifications were established based on input from public forums, user group meetings, and meetings with trails planners from surrounding jurisdictions. These are standard configurations. They can be enhanced depending on the situation.


Divided Urban Pathway



The Divided Urban Pathway is the largest paved pathway within the City. This pathway consists of a separated, minimum 12'-15', paved pathway and a minimum 8-10', stabilized, decomposed granite trail separated by landscaping. The path and trail have a minimum of 6'-8' of landscaping on either side, however, the side furthest from the road or wash has a preferred minimum landscape buffer of 10 feet. Landscape buffer width should be developed to the maximum extent feasible, depending on the situation. Pathways and trails should meander whenever possible while still preserving sight lines.


Appendix B – Urban Pathway System

Urban Pathway



The Urban Pathway is a minimum 12'-15' paved, shared-use trail shared by pedestrians and cyclists. The guidelines allocate a minimum of 6'- 8' of landscaping on both sides of the path. The landscape area adjacent to a wash is optional depending on right-of-way availability. This classification utilizes existing pathways to make important connections to park facilities, but in many cases recommends that the pathway be upgraded to 12'-15' standard.


Urban Trail



The Urban Trail is a minimum 8'-10' wide natural surface earthen trail with 5' of landscaping on one or both sides of the trail. A mountain bike could be used on these trails; however, they are designed primarily for pedestrian users. Urban Trails are intended for recreational use and to connect smaller neighborhood parks to larger community and metro parks via a pathway network. They may also provide connections to trail systems of other jurisdictions.


Appendix B – Urban Pathway System

Enhanced Sidewalk




The Enhanced Sidewalk uses Mountain Avenue as a model. This classification is for urban areas where there is no watercourse or insufficient right of way or corridor to develop a separate trail. The Enhanced Sidewalk is a 6-12', concrete sidewalk with a minimum of 5' of landscaping on both sides. The sidewalk is for pedestrian use. Cyclists are accommodated by the existing bike routes; or when possible install a 3' buffer between the travel and bike lane. The buffer lane, as implemented on Mountain Avenue, is designed to visually separate the bike and vehicular lanes with a distinct material such as brick or bominite.

River Park Pathway



The River Park Pathway consists of a separated, minimum 12'-15', paved pathway and a minimum 8-10', stabilized, decomposed granite trail separated by a minimum of 5' of landscape buffer. The path and trail have a minimum of 15'-40' of landscape buffer on either side. Landscape buffer width should be developed to the maximum extent feasible, depending on the situation. Pathways and trails should meander whenever possible while still preserving sight lines.

Appendix B – Urban Pathway System



NATURAL RESOURCES

One of the mandatory elements of the Growing Smarter Legislation in Arizona specifies that local General Plans must address the physical development of a community and how open space and natural resource management interfaces with it. Four typical areas are to be covered by open space elements: Open space for the preservation of natural resources, open space for the managed production of resources, open space for health and safety and open space for outdoor recreation.

The City of Tucson is committed to providing meaningful parks and open spaces through a variety of recreation venues, both passive and active, for all residents to enjoy. Currently the City holds 3,092 acres of park related properties. This accounts for 5.9 acres per 1,000 residents, which is below regional and national averages. As the City continues to grow, demand for parks, trails, outdoor recreation, open space and wildlife habitat will put more pressure on existing resources unless the City aggressively pursues land acquisition for parks and open space.

The Tucson Parks & Recreation Department needs to provide a framework to identify, acquire and enhance a system of open space within the Tucson planning area. A park system needs to be designed in a way that provides an appropriate level of open space and park acres to frame neighborhoods, protect natural resource areas that are unique to Tucson and create destination places for all citizens to enjoy. The Strategic Service Plan for Tucson establishes a goal of 7 acres per 1,000 residents for the core and mid-City areas and 11 acres per 1,000 residents for edge and future City. Achieving this goal will help Tucson stay ahead of development and provide the necessary land acreage

requirements for health and safety of people as well and for wildlife protection.

The benefits of providing this level of space requirements are numerous. Urban heat, water runoff and erosion will be reduced. Spaces for wildlife habitat and passive recreation pursuits will be provided. Finally, the hydrological resources will be protected, downstream flooding will decrease and particular attributes of the Sonoran Desert will be preserved.

The recreational opportunities this additional open space will provide include bird watching, fishing, wildlife viewing, and hiking, walking, biking and educational interpretation programs.

LAND ANALYSIS AND ACQUISITION PROCESS FOR NATURAL OPEN SPACE

The goals for land analysis and acquisition process for natural open space start with clear objectives for each component of an overall open space plan for the City.

- Develop a process for identification, evaluation of natural value, prioritization and acquisition of natural open space.
- Identify an acceptable level of natural open space within the City limits.
- Conduct a GIS-based inventory of existing protected natural open space within City limits.
- Identify gaps of natural open space within City limits.
- Analyze the results of previous City of Tucson Open Space Inventory for City-Owned Properties.

- Identify opportunities to preserve natural open space and provide new trail opportunities.
- Identify areas where natural open space goals may be met by setting rezoning conditions on private development.
- Develop GIS system to track privately owned natural open space protected by land use code and privately owned natural open space open to the public.
- Develop a plan to identify, enhance and protect scenic views that are within or part of the parks system.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONNECTIVITY

- Identify opportunities for connections between natural open space within the City and protected natural open space outside and adjacent to City limits.
- Identify opportunities for connections between privately owned protected natural open space and City-owned natural open space.

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

- Identify ecologically significant natural open spaces.
- Identify wildlife corridors
- Identify opportunities to attract appropriate wildlife to public viewing areas in the urban area.
- Develop interpretive signage and bulletin boards for native vegetation and wildlife and urban fishing program.
- Identify population and diversity of key native wildlife species in urban areas.

MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS

- Develop a system-wide plan for the management of urban wildlife areas including lakes, golf courses and natural resource parks and natural resource areas within parks

- Develop a vegetation management plan for natural open spaces.
- Train staff on managing wildlife habitat areas and sensitive plant environments.
- Educate staff on non-native species management

PARTNERSHIPS IN OPEN SPACE AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

These partnerships would add value and credibility to the planning and management of these resources and should be included in the overall City approach to natural resource management.

- Reid Park Zoo
- City of Tucson Department of Transportation
- City of Tucson Water Department
- University of Arizona
- Pima County Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation
- Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum
- Arizona Game & Fish Department
- Audubon Society
- Tucson Herpetological Society
- Tucson School Districts

POTENTIAL SITES FOR WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS

- Lakeside Lake
- Silverbell Lake
- Kennedy Lake
- John F. Kennedy Park
- Christopher Columbus Park
- Ft Lowell Riparian area
- Lincoln Park

- Atterbury Wash
- Santa Cruz River Park
- Alamo Wash
- Arcadia Wash
- Arroyo Chico
- Citation Wash through Reid Park
- Case Park
- Rio Vista Park
- Undeveloped parcels on Silverbell Rd
- General Instruments Site
- Valle Allegre(undeveloped park)
- Vista Del Rio Park
- Juhan Park
- San Juan Park
- Sentinel Peak Park
- Don Hummel Park
- City Golf Course lakes
- Houghton(undeveloped park)

PARKS AND FACILITIES PLAN

The Parks and Facilities analysis utilized a computer-based Geographic Information System (GIS) program. Data that was incorporated into the program included the City's current inventory of parks and facilities, citizen survey results, City population for 2000, projected population for 2010 and 2013, and selected populations for youth (under 18 years) and seniors (60 years and over). Income levels and stress indicators prepared by the City of Tucson Planning Department were also mapped. Five park types were identified for the Tucson parks system based on parameters of park size, service area radius and operational

guidelines (Table 1). These parameters are based on national park standards, standards of comparable cities across the nation and stated needs of the community.

For the parks analysis, two different guidelines were used for different areas of the City: 1) Core/Mid-City guidelines 2) Edge/future City guidelines. Using the City of Tucson Planning Department Development Areas as a base, these guidelines were established to reflect the difference in population density, land availability, and overall build-out of different areas.

Table 1: Service Area Analysis Guidelines

| Park Guidelines | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Park Type | Standard Park Size | Service Radius of Park | Core/Mid-City Guideline | Edge/Future City Guideline | Population Type |
| Mini Park | 1 ac max | 1/4 mile | 1 ac/1,000 persons | 1 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |
| Neighborhood/ School Park | 1-15 ac | 1/2 mile | 2.5 ac/1,000 persons | 2.5 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |
| Community Park | 15-40 ac | 1 mile | 3 ac/1,000 persons | 3 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |
| Metro Park | 40-200 ac | 2.5 miles | 1.5 ac/1,000 persons | 3.5 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |
| Regional Park | >200 ac | 7 miles | Not applicable | 2 ac/1,000 persons | Total population |
| Facility Guidelines | | | | | |
| Facility Type | Guideline | | | Population Type | |
| Adult Baseball (>200') | 1 field/12,000 persons | | | Total population | |
| Youth Baseball (<200') | 1 field/10,000 persons | | | Youth population | |
| Soccer/Football | 1 field/12,000 persons | | | Total & Youth & Disabled | |
| Softball | 1 field/10,000 persons | | | Total & Youth & Disabled | |
| Park-site pathways within parks | 1 mi/15,000 persons | | | Total & Senior & Disabled | |
| Playgrounds | 1 playground/2,500 persons | | | Total population | |
| Swimming Pools (year-round and seasonal) | Neighborhood: 1 pool/5,000 | | | Total population | |
| | Community: 1 pool /15,000 | | | | |
| | Family Aquatic Center: 1 pool /30,000 | | | | |
| | Heated/Year-round: 1 pool /50,000 | | | | |
| Recreation Centers | 1 sf per person served based on size of center | | | Total & Senior & Disabled | |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

As can be seen from the Parks and Facilities per Population Guidelines (Table 4), Tucson has not met the current national guidelines in any of its park or facility categories. In many cases, this is because of the limited availability of land for park facilities in the core/mid-City. As a result, two sets of guidelines were established. The core/mid-City guidelines place emphasis on enhancing the amenities and facilities currently in parks, whereas the edge/future City guidelines provide for more park land acquisition. Table 4 shows additional parks and facilities needed to achieve the guideline standards by 2013 based on population growth estimates (Table 5). These are facilities that must be built in addition to facilities already included in City/County Bond programs, and in anticipated future inter-governmental agreements with schools. Table 5-A depicts the park acreage per 1,000 residents over the last 30 years.

Table 4: Parks and Facilities per Population Guidelines*

| Facility Type | 2000 Total** | Current Facility/ Population Ratio(2000) | Core/Mid-City Guidelines | Edge/ Future- City Guidelines | Additional Parks/Facilities Needed to Achieve Guidelines By 2013 | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| | | | | | Core/Mid-City | Edge/ Future- City | City-wide |
| Parks(acres) | | | | | | | |
| Mini Park | 5 | .01 /1,000 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Neighborhood*** | 515 | 1.1/1,000 | 2.5/1,000 | 2.5 /1,000 | 188 | 355 | 543 |
| Community | 504 | 1.1/1,000 | 3/1,000 | 3 /1,000 | 795 | 388 | 1,183 |
| Metro | 1450 | 3.1/1,000 | 1.5/1,000 | 3.5/1,000 | 0 | 201 | 201 |
| Regional | 619 | 1.3/1,000 | N/A | 2/1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Parks | 3092 | 6.5/1,000 | 7/1,000 | 11/1,000 | 982 | 944 | 1,926 |
| Field Sports | | | | | | | |
| Adult Baseball | 30 | 1/15,848 | 1/12,000 | 1/12,000 | | | 18 |
| Youth Baseball | 42 | 1/11,596 | 1/10,000 | 1/10,000 | | | 16 |
| Soccer Fields | 33 | 1/14,858 | 1/12,000 | 1/12,000 | | | 16 |
| Softball Fields | 36 | 1/13,207 | 1/10,000 | 1/10,000 | | | 21 |
| Active Recreation | | | | | | | |
| Park-site pathways(miles) | 10 | 1/47,545 | 1/15,000 | 1/15,000 | | | 39 |
| Playgrounds | 105 | 1/4,755 | 1/2,500 | 1/2,500 | | | 133 |
| Centers (sq. ft.) | 333,528 | .7/person | 1/person | 1/person | | | 244,737 |

*Original calculations by consultant for additional parks/facilities needed have been adjusted to allow for a 13 year planning period (2000-2013) versus 10 year (2000-2010). Calculations have been increased based on the estimated annual population increase for the 3 years between 2010 and 2013(see Table 5).

**Totals include City of Tucson Facilities only.

***Includes school-park facilities under existing IGA

N/A - Not applicable

Table 5: Projected Population

| Projected Population | Total Population | Core/Mid-City | Edge/Future-City |
|----------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 1989 ₁ | 397,300 | 338,654 | 58,646 |
| 1999 ₁ | 475,450 | 366,898 | 108,552 |
| 2000 ₂ | 486,699 | | |
| 2003 ₃ | 515,175 | | |
| 2010 ₁ | 569,980 | | |
| 2013 ₄ | 595,385 | | |

₁ Strategic Plan 2000 Demographic Analysis

₂ April 1st 2000 Population according to Tucson Update 2003

₃ Estimated July 2003 population according to Tucson Update 2003.

₄ Estimated population, according to Population Estimates and Projections 1870-2050, 6/2/03, City of Tucson Comprehensive Planning Task Force

Table 5-A: Park Acres Per 1,000 Residents

| YEAR | 1975 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2006 |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| CITY POPULATION | 298,683 | 330,537 | 405,390 | 486,699 | 541,618 |
| PARK ACRES | 1043 | 2046 | 2880 | 3059 | 3063 |
| PARK ACRES PER 1,000 RESIDENTS | 3.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 5.7 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

Table 6: Future Park Expansion - Additional Facilities Needed to Achieve Guidelines by Planning Area

| | | Funded Needs by 2013 | | Unfunded Needs by Planning Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Facility Type | Service Area Needs by 2013 | 2000 Bond Facilities | Future IGAs | Total Unfunded Needs | Priority Area 1* | Priority Area 2* | Priority Area 3* | Future Planning Area* | Needs to be met in other areas of City |
| Parks(acres) | | | | | | | | | |
| Neighborhood | 543 | 0 | 0 | 543 | 141 | 115 | 49 | N/A** | 238 |
| Community | 1,183 | 0 | 0 | 1,183 | 169 | 138 | 58 | N/A** | 819 |
| Metro | 201 | 90 | 0 | 110 | N/A | N/A | 110 | (1)* | 0 |
| Regional | (1)* | 0 | 0 | (1)* | N/A | N/A | (1)* | N/A** | 0 |
| Total | 1,926 | 90 | 0 | 1,836 | 309 | 253 | 217 | 0 | 1,057 |
| Field Sports | | | | | | | | | |
| Adult Baseball | 18 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 4 | | 0 |
| Youth Baseball | 16 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 3 | | 3 |
| Soccer Fields | 16 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | 5 |
| Softball Fields | 21 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 2 | | 11 |
| Active Recreation | | | | | | | | | |
| Park-site pathways (miles) | 39 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 10 | 5 | 11 | | 13 |
| Playgrounds | 133 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 19 | 16 | 10 | | 89 |
| Centers (sq.ft.) | 244,737 | 131,417 | 0 | 113,320 | 57,800 | | 28,900 | | 26,620 |

* Priority Areas 1 and 2 needs based on Core/Mid-City Guidelines

* Priority Area 3 and Future Planning Area needs based on Edge/Future City Guidelines

** Not applicable until future development plans are known

(1)* One new Regional Park and one new Metro Park to be located in southeast area

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

Cost Of Improvements

The cost estimates are for construction of new park facilities only. The Parks and Recreation Department will develop a 10-year Renovation and Rehabilitation Schedule outlining the renovation and rehabilitation of existing facilities. The renovation

and rehabilitation estimates are in addition to the costs identified in Table 7. Projected costs are a direct result of the service area analysis and the projected needs of recreational users in Tucson. The costs for the improvements are stated in current dollars and do not include an inflation factor.

Table 7: Estimated Costs of Unfunded Needs by Planning Area (\$'s)

| Facility Type | Facility Cost/Unit | Priority Area 1 | Priority Area 2 | Priority Area 3 | Future Planning Area | Needs to be met in other areas of City | Total |
|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------|------------|
| Parks(acres)* | | | | | | | |
| Neighborhood | | | | | | | |
| Community | | | | | | | |
| Metro | | | | | | | |
| Regional | | | | | | | |
| All Parks | | | | | | | |
| Field Sports | | | | | | | |
| Adult Baseball | 400,000 | 2,400,000 | 400,000 | 1,600,000 | N/A | 0 | 4,400,000 |
| Youth Baseball | 350,000 | 1,750,000 | 0 | 1,050,000 | N/A | 1,050,000 | 3,850,000 |
| Soccer Fields | 400,000 | 400,000 | 800,000 | 1,200,000 | N/A | 2,000,000 | 4,400,000 |
| Softball Fields | 375,000 | 1,875,000 | 375,000 | 750,000 | N/A | 4,125,000 | 7,125,000 |
| Active Recreation | | | | | | | |
| Park-site pathways(miles) | 116,160 | 1,161,600 | 580,800 | 1,277,760 | N/A | 1,510,080 | 4,530,240 |
| Playgrounds | 95,000 | 1,805,000 | 1,520,000 | 950,000 | N/A | 8,455,000 | 12,730,000 |
| Centers (sq. ft.) | 235 | 13,583,000 | 0 | 6,791,500 | N/A | 6,255,700 | 26,630,200 |
| Total | | 22,974,600 | 3,675,800 | 13,619,260 | N/A | 23,395,780 | 63,665,440 |

*Cost for land acquisition for new parks was not determined by the consultant as part of the strategic planning process. See Unmet Needs in Table 8 for a recent estimation of land acquisition costs.

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

The ability to project the costs associated with making the park and facility improvements is necessary in order to plan for the future. The purpose of the Parks and Facilities Analysis is to determine the needs for new parks and facilities within the City. Based on the projected demographic data and the results of the Parks and Facilities Analysis, recommendations for new park development fall into four (4) categories: 1) City and County Bond Projects, 2) Future Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA's), 3) Priority Areas, and 4) Citywide Needs. The recommendations are prioritized to minimize duplication of programs and facilities that are already provided within the City, and to satisfy facility needs to the deficient areas of the City.

City and County Bond Projects

Several on-going City and joint (City and County) bond projects will be completed within the next ten years. The new facilities are accounted for in the analysis. Overall, the bond projects provide additional facilities but they do not significantly increase the amount of park acreage the City needs. The bond projects have been approved and financing for these projects is in place.

Future Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA's)

IGA's are a way for the City to increase the number of facilities to accommodate programming needs without fully constructing new facilities. Currently the Parks and Recreation Department has agreements with twenty-four (24) schools within the Tucson Unified, Sunnyside, Amphitheater, Pima Community College, Flowing Wells, and Vail School Districts. The majority of these facilities are adult baseball fields and swimming pools. In many cases, the Parks and Recreation Department has installed lighting to allow night games and utilization of the fields after school hours. Establishing new agreements will strengthen the relationship between the Parks and Recreation Department and the local school districts, while simultaneously increasing the

number of adult baseball fields that the City can provide. Future IGA's with Pima Community College, Sunnyside, and Tucson Unified School Districts could provide additional facilities.

Priority Areas

Based on the Parks and Facilities analysis, three priority areas were identified within the City. These priority areas represent consistent "gaps" on all of the service area maps. The "gaps" are areas that are not captured by the service area of any park. Prioritization of "gaps" was analyzed to include factors of high density, high stress, or high projected growth within the next ten years, school enrollment projections, and average annual household income. These areas have the highest need of new parks and facilities. A service area analysis for each priority area determined the current and projected population's served, number of facilities and current facility/population ratio within the area. These numbers were compared to the Tucson Guidelines. Future needs for a priority area = (projected population x Tucson Guidelines ratio) – current number of facilities.

Each priority area identifies the number of park acres and facilities needed to meet the Tucson Guideline recommendation within the area by 2013 (Table 7). Some of the priority areas identify a need for more acreage than appears available. Those new park acres and facilities that cannot be accommodated within the priority areas will then need to be transferred to other areas of the City.

In addition, the Proposed Parks and Facilities map acknowledges a future planning area in the newly annexed southern section of the City. This future planning area identifies the potential to develop one new Metro and Regional Park in this region. As the population of Tucson continues to grow and moves into the southeastern section of the City, these parks will

provide those services and programs to the new residents in the area.

Other Areas of the City

These needs remain unmet after accounting for bond projects, future IGA's and new parks and facilities in priority areas. Citywide needs allocate facilities evenly throughout the City. Additional park acreage will most likely be acquired in the less developed parts of the City where availability of land is greatest. As resources become available, the City should actively search for available parcels throughout the City.

In order to meet future needs on a citywide basis, the following approaches are recommended:

1. Increase the Number of Facilities in Existing Parks

Some parks have adequate facilities to meet current needs, but will require additional facilities to meet future needs.

2. Build a New Facility in a New Park

New parks and facilities must be constructed in order to meet the future recreational demands in Tucson. This Strategic Service Plan identifies priority areas that have the highest need for additional park acreage and facilities. By identifying priority areas, the Parks and Recreation Department can target those areas of the City that currently have a high demand but are under-served. Included within these recommendations is the identification of future planning areas where acquisition of land should start to occur. Targeting priority areas and focusing on future planning areas, the City will develop a balanced mix of recreational uses in new park sites distributed throughout the Tucson basin.

Preliminary Unmet Needs Analysis

Strategic Planning is a long-term, dynamic and future-oriented process of assessment, goal setting and decision-making that maps an explicit path between the present and a vision of the future. Accordingly, the Parks and Recreation Ten Year Strategic Service Plan sets forth the framework and direction needed for further planning to produce Action Plans, detailed game plans needed to achieve our strategic targets.

That additional planning has begun with the establishment of a preliminary, but comprehensive inventory of unmet needs. The Unmet Needs Assessment is an extension of the work done by this Strategic Plan and looks at:

- Existing facilities in terms of needed replacements or enhancements
- Work identified by the department's 2001 Lake Quality Improvement Study
- Land needs and acquisition cost (It is noteworthy to mention that land costs are difficult to assess due to the many variables, but we have done so in order to give us a sense of the dollars that may be needed)
- Needs for Open Space, Natural Resource Parks, Trails and Greenways more closely and what it may take to provide the connectivity desired
- Zoo Improvements based on the recently completed Zoo Master Plan
- Future needs that may exist by the year 2030, based on population projections and the standards established in this document.

It is important to note that this information is a "work in progress," and further refinement is needed. However, it provides a sense or magnitude of the needs we must address to achieve our mission.

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

It is also important to note that many of the needs identified in the consultant's work were packaged or incorporated into site-specific projects under the category of Existing Facilities Replacement and Enhancement Needs summarized below.

Consequently, a direct correlation between the consultant's information and the unmet needs presented is difficult to make, but the \$63,665,440 identified by the Consultant is part of the totals presented below (Table 8).


Table 8: Unmet Needs

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| EXISTING UNMET NEEDS | |
| ▪ NEW FACILITIES NEEDS RELATED TO GROWTH TO 2013 (an additional \$36,572,200 incorporated into site specific projects under existing facilities) | \$27,093,700* |
| ▪ LAND ACQUISITION NEEDS RELATED TO GROWTH TO 2013 | \$160,500,000* |
| ▪ EXISTING FACILITIES REPLACEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT NEEDS (includes priority projects, centers and parks) | \$180,774,600 |
| ▪ OPEN SPACE, NATURAL RESOURCE PARKS, TRAILS AND GREENWAY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS | \$37,600,000 |
| ▪ ZOO IMPROVEMENT NEEDS | \$24,496,000 |
| ▪ CULTURAL/HISTORIC FACILITY NEEDS | \$27,550,000 |
| FUTURE GROWTH RELATED UNMET NEEDS | |
| ▪ FUTURE-GROWTH RELATED NEEDS RELATED TO GROWTH FROM 2014 TO 2030 | \$127,035,000* |
| ▪ LAND ACQUISITION NEEDS RELATED TO GROWTH FROM 2014 TO 2030 | \$173,200,000* |


*Projects in these categories may be eligible for Impact Fees

**It is anticipated that by the year 2025 approximately \$83.5 million in Impact Fees will be collected for park facilities.

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan



Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan



Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

Park Inventory

List of Parks by City Ward

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| 7 | 1 | Cherokee Avenue Park | 900 N. Cherokee Av | Mini | 0.6 |
| 9 | 1 | Christopher Columbus Park | 4600 N. Silverbell Rd | Regional | 346.2 |
| 16 | 1 | El Presidio Plaza Park | 160 W. Alameda St | Special Interest | 2.8 |
| 20 | 1 | Estevan Park | 1000 N. Main Av | Neighborhood | 7.8 |
| 21 | 1 | Manuel Herrera Jr. Park | 5901 S. Fiesta Av | Neighborhood | 3.2 |
| 25 | 1 | Garden Of Gethsemane | 602 W. Congress Av | Special Interest | 0.3 |
| 27 | 1 | Greasewood Park | 1075 N. Greasewood Rd | Metro Natural Resource | 160.0 |
| 38 | 1 | John F. Kennedy Park | Ajo Wy And Mission Rd | Metro | 167.6 |
| 39 | 1 | Juhan Park | 1770 W. Copper St | Community | 16.9 |
| 51 | 1 | Menlo Park | 300 N. Grande Av | Neighborhood | 11.5 |
| 57 | 1 | Mission Manor Park | 6100 S. 12th Av | Community | 38.1 |
| 60 | 1 | Joaquin Murrieta Park | 1400 N. Silverbell Rd | Community | 38.0 |
| 61 | 1 | Oaktree Park | 5433 S. Oaktree Dr | Neighborhood | 7.3 |
| 62 | 1 | Ormsby Park | 24th St. and Verdugo Av | Neighborhood | 4.8 |
| 63 | 1 | David G. Herrera and Ramon Quiroz Park | 600 W. St Marys Rd | Neighborhood | 6.4 |
| 70 | 1 | Riverview Park | 1600 N. Yavapai St | Mini | 0.9 |
| 76 | 1 | San Juan Park | 1665 S. La Cholla Bd | Community | 38.8 |
| 77 | 1 | Santa Cruz River Park | West Of Interstate 10 | Metro | 125.1 |
| 81 | 1 | Seminole Park | 600 N. Seminole Av | Mini | 0.5 |
| 82 | 1 | Sentinel Peak Park | 1000 S. Sentinel Peak Rd | Regional Natural Resource | 272.9 |
| 86 | 1 | Sunset Park | 255 W. Alameda St | Mini | 0.3 |
| 95 | 1 | Verdugo Park | 19th St and Verdugo Av | Mini | 0.5 |
| 98 | 1 | Vista del Pueblo Park | 1800 W. San Marcos Bd | Neighborhood | 3.7 |
| 107 | 1 | Cholla High School/Park | 2001 W. 22nd St | Neighborhood School | 18.3 |
| 113 | 1 | Manzo Elementary School | 1301 W. Ontario St | Neighborhood School | 2.8 |
| 126 | 1 | Pima Community College (West) | 2202 W. Anklam Rd | Neighborhood School | 3.7 |
| * | 1 | Desert Vista District Park | 6091 W Calle Santa Cruz | Neighborhood School | 8.3 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| * | 1 | Dunbar School Park | 325 West 2nd | Neighborhood School | 0.5 |
| * | 1 | Rodeo Wash Park II | 621 W. Columbia St | Neighborhood | 6.2 |
| | | | | Total Ward 1 | 1294.0 |
| 4 | 2 | Case Park | 9851 E. Kenyon Dr | Metro Natural Resource | 40.5 |
| 23 | 2 | Fort Lowell Park | 2900 N. Craycroft Rd | Metro | 58.9 |
| 29 | 2 | Harold Bell Wright Park | Corinth and Shepherd Hills Dr | Neighborhood | 2.5 |
| 37 | 2 | Jesse Owens Park | 400 S. Sarnoff Dr | Community | 39.1 |
| 50 | 2 | McCormick Park | 2950 N. Columbus Bd | Community | 18.0 |
| 64 | 2 | Palo Verde Park | 425 S. Mann Av | Community | 30.7 |
| 83 | 2 | Stefan Gollob Park | 401 S. Prudence Rd | Neighborhood | 7.4 |
| 94 | 2 | Morris K. Udall Park | 7290 E. Tanque Verde Rd | Metro | 172.8 |
| 96 | 2 | Villa Serena Park | 5900 E. Calle Serena | Neighborhood | 1.6 |
| 99 | 2 | Vista del Rio Park | 7575 E. Desert Arbor St | Neighborhood | 3.0 |
| 105 | 2 | Booth-Fickett Middle School | 7240 E. Calle Arturo | Neighborhood School | 12.6 |
| 110 | 2 | Rollin Gridley Middle School | 350 S. Harrison Rd | Neighborhood School | 10.6 |
| 112 | 2 | Magee Middle School | 8300 E. Speedway Bd | Neighborhood School | 11.4 |
| 118 | 2 | Sahuaro High School | 545 N. Camino Seco | Neighborhood School | 18.3 |
| * | 2 | Hudlow Elementary School | 502 N. Caribe Av | Neighborhood School | 4.0 |
| | | | | Total Ward 2 | 431.4 |
| 2 | 3 | Balboa Heights Park | 2526 N. Castro Av | Neighborhood | 1.2 |
| 10 | 3 | Conner Park | 2200 E. Glenn St | Neighborhood | 2.0 |
| 34 | 3 | Don Hummel Park | 4255 N. 4th Av | Neighborhood | 6.6 |
| 35 | 3 | Jacinto Park | 2600 N. 15th Av | Neighborhood | 1.6 |
| 36 | 3 | Jacobs Park | 3300 N. Fairview Av | Metro | 49.2 |
| 42 | 3 | La Madera Park | 2700 E. La Madera Dr | Neighborhood | 5.2 |
| 47 | 3 | Mansfield Park | 2000 N. 4th Av | Community | 20.4 |
| 49 | 3 | Manuel Valenzuela Alvarez Park | 1945 N. Calle Central | Mini | 0.2 |
| 55 | 3 | Miracle Mile Manor Park | 850 W. Grant Rd | Undeveloped | 1.1 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| 58 | 3 | Mitchell Park | 1100 E. Mitchell St | Neighborhood | 1.8 |
| 59 | 3 | North Central Park | 3861 N. Cactus Bd | Community Natural Resource | 38.7 |
| 103 | 3 | Amphitheater High School | 125 W. Yavapai Rd | Neighborhood School | 18.5 |
| 104 | 3 | Amphitheater Middle School | 315 E. Prince Rd | Neighborhood School | 14.0 |
| 109 | 3 | Flowing Wells High School | 3725 N. Flowing Wells Rd | Neighborhood School | 0.7 |
| 111 | 3 | Jefferson Park Elementary School | 1701 E. Seneca St | Neighborhood School | 1.1 |
| 114 | 3 | E.C. Nash Elementary School | 515 W. Kelso St | Neighborhood School | 3.0 |
| 116 | 3 | Richey Elementary School | 2209 N. 15th Av | Neighborhood School | 3.7 |
| 122 | 3 | Amphi Neighborhood Park | 510 E. Navajo Rd | Neighborhood | 1.8 |
| * | 3 | Keeling Desert Park | 245 E. Glenn St | Mini | 0.7 |
| * | 3 | Rio Vista Natural Resources Park | 3974 N. Tucson Bd | Community | 38.0 |
| * | 3 | Sixth Avenue Commemorative Pet Park | 2075 N. 6th Av | Special Interest | 1.6 |
| | | | | Total Ward 3 | 211.1 |
| 19 | 4 | Escalante Park | 6900 E. Nicaragua Dr | Neighborhood | 4.9 |
| 26 | 4 | Golf Links Sports Complex | 2400 S. Craycroft Rd | Metro | 54.0 |
| 28 | 4 | Groves Park | 7400 E. Juniper Dr | Neighborhood | 10.0 |
| 30 | 4 | Harriet Johnson Park | 6100 E. 25th St | Neighborhood | 1.4 |
| 33 | 4 | Houghton Park | 5600 S. Houghton Rd | Undeveloped | 70.0 |
| 41 | 4 | Lakeside (Charles Ford) Park | 8300 E. Stella Rd | Metro | 50.5 |
| 45 | 4 | Abraham Lincoln Park | 8280 E. Escalante Rd | Metro | 190.8 |
| 52 | 4 | Mesa Village Park | 5700 E. 18th St | Neighborhood | 2.4 |
| 53 | 4 | Michael Perry Park | 8700 E. Arbor St | Community | 34.9 |
| 68 | 4 | Purple Heart Park | 10050 E. Rita Rd | Community | 36.3 |
| 74 | 4 | Rolling Hills Park | 8900 E. 29th St | Neighborhood | 4.5 |
| 80 | 4 | Sears Park | 5900 E. 14th St | Neighborhood | 9.7 |
| 90 | 4 | Tierra Del Sol Park | 6700 E. Calle Marta | Neighborhood | 3.5 |
| 97 | 4 | Vista del Prado Park | 6900 E. Stella Rd | Neighborhood | 8.6 |
| 101 | 4 | Wilshire Heights Park | 5500 E. 14th St | Neighborhood | 2.4 |
| 115 | 4 | Palo Verde High School | 1302 S. Avenida Vega | Neighborhood School | 16.9 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| 119 | 4 | Santa Rita High School | 3951 S. Pantano Rd | Neighborhood School | 21.4 |
| | | | | Total Ward 4 | 522.2 |
| 3 | 5 | Bravo Park | 4595 S. Mountain Av | Neighborhood | 5.3 |
| 8 | 5 | Cherry Avenue Park | 5085 S. Cherry Av | Neighborhood | 5.0 |
| 11 | 5 | Country Club Annex Park | 3300 E. Aviation Hy | Neighborhood | 2.7 |
| 14 | 5 | Desert Shadows Park | Greenway Dr and Ponderosa Pl | Neighborhood | 6.4 |
| 15 | 5 | Eastmoor Park | 2500 E. Aviation Hy | Neighborhood | 2.4 |
| 17 | 5 | El Pueblo Park | 101 W. Irvington Rd | Neighborhood | 8.7 |
| 24 | 5 | Freedom Park | 5000 E. 29th St | Community | 34.5 |
| 40 | 5 | Silverlake Park | 1575 E. 36th St | Metro | 52.8 |
| 44 | 5 | Mariposa Park | 310 E. Aviation Dr | Mini | 0.5 |
| 56 | 5 | Mirasol Park | 1100 E. Silverlake Rd | Neighborhood | 5.5 |
| 65 | 5 | Parkview Park | 3700 E. 24th St | Neighborhood | 3.5 |
| 67 | 5 | Pueblo Gardens Park | 2500 E. 36th St | Neighborhood | 5.2 |
| 71 | 5 | Rodeo Grounds | 4825 S. 6th Av | Special Interest | 36.6 |
| 72 | 5 | Rudy Garcia Park | 5001 S. Nogales Hy | Metro | 50.0 |
| 73 | 5 | Rodeo Wash Park | Michigan and 9th Av | Neighborhood | 9.9 |
| 78 | 5 | Santa Rita Park | 401 E. 22nd Av | Community | 22.7 |
| 79 | 5 | Santa Rosa Park | 1085 S. 10th Av | Neighborhood | 8.1 |
| 84 | 5 | Street Scene Park | 39th St and Euclid Av | Mini | 0.6 |
| 85 | 5 | Sunnyside Park | 5811 S. Del Moral Bd | Community | 32.0 |
| 87 | 5 | Swan Park | 1700 S. Swan Rd | Neighborhood | 5.5 |
| 91 | 5 | James Thomas Park | 3200 S. Forgeus Av | Neighborhood | 9.0 |
| 102 | 5 | Iron Horse Park | 75 N. 1st Av | Neighborhood | 5.0 |
| 120 | 5 | Sunnyside High School | 1725 E. Bilby Rd | Neighborhood School | 0.7 |
| 123 | 5 | Utterback Middle School | 3233 S. Pinal Vista | Neighborhood School | 7.7 |
| 127 | 5 | Wakefield School | 101 W. 44th St | Neighborhood School | 5.0 |
| | | | | Total Ward 5 | 325.3 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| 1 | 6 | Alvernon Park | 3900 E. 3rd St | Neighborhood | 2.8 |
| 5 | 6 | Catalina Park | 900 N. 4th Av | Neighborhood | 4.2 |
| 6 | 6 | Jardin de Cesar Chavez Park | E. 18th St and 6th Av | Mini | 0.1 |
| 12 | 6 | De Anza Park | 1000 N. Stone Av | Neighborhood | 5.4 |
| 13 | 6 | Desert Aire Park | 600 S. Beverly Bd | Neighborhood | 1.7 |
| 18 | 6 | El Tiradito Wishing Shrine | 400 S. Main Av | Special Interest | 0.1 |
| 22 | 6 | Francisco Elias Esquer Park | 1331 N. 14th Av | Neighborhood | 1.4 |
| 31 | 6 | Himmel Park | 1000 N. Tucson Bd | Community | 26.4 |
| 32 | 6 | Hoffman Park | 4800 E. Cecilia St | Neighborhood | 3.8 |
| 46 | 6 | Linden Park | 300 S. Desert Av | Neighborhood | 3.4 |
| 48 | 6 | Veinte De Agosto Park | Broadway Bd and Church Av | Special Interest | 1.0 |
| 54 | 6 | Military Plaza Park | 221 S. 6th Av | Neighborhood | 4.1 |
| 66 | 6 | Pinecrest Park | 4800 E. Fairmont St | Neighborhood | 1.5 |
| 69 | 6 | Gene C. Reid Park | 900 S. Randolph Wy | Metro | 131.3 |
| 75 | 6 | San Augustine Park | 119 W. Broadway Bd | Mini | 0.4 |
| 88 | 6 | Swanway Park | 4800 E. 1st St | Neighborhood | 2.3 |
| 89 | 6 | Tahoe Park | 2000 E. Edison St | Neighborhood | 2.1 |
| 92 | 6 | Toumey Park | 4500 E. Eastland St | Neighborhood | 6.6 |
| 93 | 6 | 20/30 Park | 5300 E. 7th St | Neighborhood | 5.5 |
| 106 | 6 | Catalina High School | 3645 E. Pima St | Neighborhood School | 17.7 |
| 108 | 6 | Doolen Middle School | 2400 N. Country Club Rd | Neighborhood School | 10.7 |
| 117 | 6 | Rincon High School | 422 N. Arcadia Av | Neighborhood School | 17.5 |
| 121 | 6 | Townsend Middle School | 2120 N. Beverly Bd | Neighborhood School | 10.8 |
| 124 | 6 | Blenman Elementary School | 1695 N. County Club Rd | Neighborhood School | 2.9 |
| 125 | 6 | John B. Wright Elementary School | 4311 E. Linden St | Neighborhood School | 4.4 |
| * | 6 | Miramonte Natural Resources Park | 701 N. Richey Bd | Mini Natural Resource | 1.0 |
| * | 6 | San Gabriel Park | 4056 E. Montecito St | Mini | 0.5 |
| | | | | Total Ward 6 | 269.6 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------|
| 100 | outside city limits | Valle Allegre Park | 13031 E. Redington Rd | Undeveloped | 77.0 |

* Not shown on map

| Ward | Park Acres |
|----------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 1294.0 |
| 2 | 431.4 |
| 3 | 211.1 |
| 4 | 522.2 |
| 5 | 325.3 |
| 6 | 269.6 |
| Outside City limits | 77.0 |
| Total Park Acres | 3130.6 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

List of Parks by Map#/Park Name

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 6 | Alvernon Park | 3900 E. 3rd St | Neighborhood | 2.8 |
| 2 | 3 | Balboa Heights Park | 2526 N. Castro Av | Neighborhood | 1.2 |
| 3 | 5 | Bravo Park | 4595 S. Mountain Av | Neighborhood | 5.3 |
| 4 | 2 | Case Park | 9851 E. Kenyon Dr | Metro Natural Resource | 40.5 |
| 5 | 6 | Catalina Park | 900 N. 4th Av | Neighborhood | 4.2 |
| 6 | 6 | Jardin de Cesar Chavez Park | E. 18th St and 6th Av | Mini | 0.1 |
| 7 | 1 | Cherokee Avenue Park | 900 N. Cherokee Av | Mini | 0.6 |
| 8 | 5 | Cherry Avenue Park | 5085 S. Cherry Av | Neighborhood | 5.0 |
| 9 | 1 | Christopher Columbus Park | 4600 N. Silverbell Rd | Regional | 346.2 |
| 10 | 3 | Conner Park | 2200 E. Glenn St | Neighborhood | 2.0 |
| 11 | 5 | Country Club Annex Park | 3300 E. Aviation Hy | Neighborhood | 2.7 |
| 12 | 6 | De Anza Park | 1000 N. Stone Av | Neighborhood | 5.4 |
| 13 | 6 | Desert Aire Park | 600 S. Beverly Bd | Neighborhood | 1.7 |
| 14 | 5 | Desert Shadows Park | Greenway Dr and Ponderosa Pl | Neighborhood | 6.4 |
| 15 | 5 | Eastmoor Park | 2500 E. Aviation Hy | Neighborhood | 2.4 |
| 16 | 1 | El Presidio Plaza Park | 160 W. Alameda St | Special Interest | 2.8 |
| 17 | 5 | El Pueblo Park | 101 W. Irvington Rd | Neighborhood | 8.7 |
| 18 | 6 | El Tiradito Wishing Shrine | 400 S. Main Av | Special Interest | 0.1 |
| 19 | 4 | Escalante Park | 6900 E. Nicaragua Dr | Neighborhood | 4.9 |
| 20 | 1 | Estevan Park | 1000 N. Main Av | Neighborhood | 7.8 |
| 21 | 1 | Manuel Herrera Jr. Park | 5901 S. Fiesta Av | Neighborhood | 3.2 |
| 22 | 6 | Francisco Elias Esquer Park | 1331 N. 14th Av | Neighborhood | 1.4 |
| 23 | 2 | Fort Lowell Park | 2900 N. Craycroft Rd | Metro | 58.9 |
| 24 | 5 | Freedom Park | 5000 E. 29th St | Community | 34.5 |
| 25 | 1 | Garden Of Gethsemane | 602 W. Congress Av | Special Interest | 0.3 |
| 26 | 4 | Golf Links Sports Complex | 2400 S. Craycroft Rd | Metro | 54.0 |
| 27 | 1 | Greasewood Park | 1075 N. Greasewood Rd | Metro Natural Resource | 160.0 |
| 28 | 4 | Groves Park | 7400 E. Juniper Dr | Neighborhood | 10.0 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| 29 | 2 | Harold Bell Wright Park | Corinth and Shepherd Hills Dr | Neighborhood | 2.5 |
| 30 | 4 | Harriet Johnson Park | 6100 E. 25th St | Neighborhood | 1.4 |
| 31 | 6 | Himmel Park | 1000 N. Tucson Bd | Community | 26.4 |
| 32 | 6 | Hoffman Park | 4800 E. Cecilia St | Neighborhood | 3.8 |
| 33 | 4 | Houghton Park | 5600 S. Houghton Rd | Undeveloped | 70.0 |
| 34 | 3 | Don Hummel Park | 4255 N. 4th Av | Neighborhood | 6.6 |
| 35 | 3 | Jacinto Park | 2600 N. 15th Av | Neighborhood | 1.6 |
| 36 | 3 | Jacobs Park | 3300 N. Fairview Av | Metro | 49.2 |
| 37 | 2 | Jesse Owens Park | 400 S. Sarnoff Dr | Community | 39.1 |
| 38 | 1 | John F. Kennedy Park | Ajo Wy And Mission Rd | Metro | 167.6 |
| 39 | 1 | Juhan Park | 1770 W. Copper St | Community | 16.9 |
| 40 | 5 | Silverlake Park | 1575 E. 36th St | Metro | 52.8 |
| 41 | 4 | Lakeside (Charles Ford) Park | 8300 E. Stella Rd | Metro | 50.5 |
| 42 | 3 | La Madera Park | 2700 E. La Madera Dr | Neighborhood | 5.2 |
| 44 | 5 | Mariposa Park | 310 E. Aviation Dr | Mini | 0.5 |
| 45 | 4 | Abraham Lincoln Park | 8280 E. Escalante Rd | Metro | 190.8 |
| 46 | 6 | Linden Park | 300 S. Desert Av | Neighborhood | 3.4 |
| 47 | 3 | Mansfield Park | 2000 N. 4th Av | Community | 20.4 |
| 48 | 6 | Veinte De Agosto Park | Broadway Bd and Church Av | Special Interest | 1.0 |
| 49 | 3 | Manuel Valenzuela Alvarez Park | 1945 N. Calle Central | Mini | 0.2 |
| 50 | 2 | McCormick Park | 2950 N. Columbus Bd | Community | 18.0 |
| 51 | 1 | Menlo Park | 300 N. Grande Av | Neighborhood | 11.5 |
| 52 | 4 | Mesa Village Park | 5700 E. 18th St | Neighborhood | 2.4 |
| 53 | 4 | Michael Perry Park | 8700 E. Arbor St | Community | 34.9 |
| 54 | 6 | Military Plaza Park | 221 S. 6th Av | Neighborhood | 4.1 |
| 55 | 3 | Miracle Mile Manor Park | 850 W. Grant Rd | Undeveloped | 1.1 |
| 56 | 5 | Mirasol Park | 1100 E. Silverlake Rd | Neighborhood | 5.5 |
| 57 | 1 | Mission Manor Park | 6100 S. 12th Av | Community | 38.1 |
| 58 | 3 | Mitchell Park | 1100 E. Mitchell St | Neighborhood | 1.8 |
| 59 | 3 | North Central Park | 3861 N. Cactus Bd | Community Natural Resource | 38.7 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| 60 | 1 | Joaquin Murrieta Park | 1400 N. Silverbell Rd | Community | 38.0 |
| 61 | 1 | Oaktree Park | 5433 S. Oaktree Dr | Neighborhood | 7.3 |
| 62 | 1 | Ormsby Park | 24th St. and Verdugo Av | Neighborhood | 4.8 |
| 63 | 1 | David G. Herrera and Ramon Quiroz Park | 600 W. St Marys Rd | Neighborhood | 6.4 |
| 64 | 2 | Palo Verde Park | 425 S. Mann Av | Community | 30.7 |
| 65 | 5 | Parkview Park | 3700 E. 24th St | Neighborhood | 3.5 |
| 66 | 6 | Pinecrest Park | 4800 E. Fairmont St | Neighborhood | 1.5 |
| 67 | 5 | Pueblo Gardens Park | 2500 E. 36th St | Neighborhood | 5.2 |
| 68 | 4 | Purple Heart Park | 10050 E. Rita Rd | Community | 36.3 |
| 69 | 6 | Gene C. Reid Park | 900 S. Randolph Wy | Metro | 131.3 |
| 70 | 1 | Riverview Park | 1600 N. Yavapai St | Mini | 0.9 |
| 71 | 5 | Rodeo Grounds | 4825 S. 6th Av | Special Interest | 36.6 |
| 72 | 5 | Rudy Garcia Park | 5001 S. Nogales Hy | Metro | 50.0 |
| 73 | 5 | Rodeo Wash Park | Michigan and 9th Av | Neighborhood | 9.9 |
| 74 | 4 | Rolling Hills Park | 8900 E. 29th St | Neighborhood | 4.5 |
| 75 | 6 | San Augustine Park | 119 W. Broadway Bd | Mini | 0.4 |
| 76 | 1 | San Juan Park | 1665 S. La Cholla Bd | Community | 38.8 |
| 77 | 1 | Santa Cruz River Park | West Of Interstate 10 | Metro | 125.1 |
| 78 | 5 | Santa Rita Park | 401 E. 22nd Av | Community | 22.7 |
| 79 | 5 | Santa Rosa Park | 1085 S. 10th Av | Neighborhood | 8.1 |
| 80 | 4 | Sears Park | 5900 E. 14th St | Neighborhood | 9.7 |
| 81 | 1 | Seminole Park | 600 N. Seminole Av | Mini | 0.5 |
| 82 | 1 | Sentinel Peak Park | 1000 S. Sentinel Peak Rd | Regional Natural Resource | 272.9 |
| 83 | 2 | Stefan Gollob Park | 401 S. Prudence Rd | Neighborhood | 7.4 |
| 84 | 5 | Street Scene Park | 39th St and Euclid Av | Mini | 0.6 |
| 85 | 5 | Sunnyside Park | 5811 S. Del Moral Bd | Community | 32.0 |
| 86 | 1 | Sunset Park | 255 W. Alameda St | Mini | 0.3 |
| 87 | 5 | Swan Park | 1700 S. Swan Rd | Neighborhood | 5.5 |
| 88 | 6 | Swanway Park | 4800 E. 1st St | Neighborhood | 2.3 |
| 89 | 6 | Tahoe Park | 2000 E. Edison St | Neighborhood | 2.1 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| 90 | 4 | Tierra Del Sol Park | 6700 E. Calle Marta | Neighborhood | 3.5 |
| 91 | 5 | James Thomas Park | 3200 S. Forgeus Av | Neighborhood | 9.0 |
| 92 | 6 | Toumey Park | 4500 E. Eastland St | Neighborhood | 6.6 |
| 93 | 6 | 20/30 Park | 5300 E. 7th St | Neighborhood | 5.5 |
| 94 | 2 | Morris K. Udall Park | 7290 E. Tanque Verde Rd | Metro | 172.8 |
| 95 | 1 | Verdugo Park | 19th St and Verdugo Av | Mini | 0.5 |
| 96 | 2 | Villa Serena Park | 5900 E. Calle Serena | Neighborhood | 1.6 |
| 97 | 4 | Vista del Prado Park | 6900 E. Stella Rd | Neighborhood | 8.6 |
| 98 | 1 | Vista del Pueblo Park | 1800 W. San Marcos Bd | Neighborhood | 3.7 |
| 99 | 2 | Vista del Rio Park | 7575 E. Desert Arbor St | Neighborhood | 3.0 |
| 100 | outside city limits | Valle Alegre Park | 13031 E. Redington Rd | Undeveloped | 77.0 |
| 101 | 4 | Wilshire Heights Park | 5500 E. 14th St | Neighborhood | 2.4 |
| 102 | 5 | Iron Horse Park | 75 N. 1st Av | Neighborhood | 5.0 |
| 103 | 3 | Amphitheater High School | 125 W. Yavapai Rd | Neighborhood School | 18.5 |
| 104 | 3 | Amphitheater Middle School | 315 E. Prince Rd | Neighborhood School | 14.0 |
| 105 | 2 | Booth-Fickett Middle School | 7240 E. Calle Arturo | Neighborhood School | 12.6 |
| 106 | 6 | Catalina High School | 3645 E. Pima St | Neighborhood School | 17.7 |
| 107 | 1 | Cholla High School/Park | 2001 W. 22nd St | Neighborhood School | 18.3 |
| 108 | 6 | Doolen Middle School | 2400 N. Country Club Rd | Neighborhood School | 10.7 |
| 109 | 3 | Flowing Wells High School | 3725 N. Flowing Wells Rd | Neighborhood School | 0.7 |
| 110 | 2 | Rollin Gridley Middle School | 350 S. Harrison Rd | Neighborhood School | 10.6 |
| 111 | 3 | Jefferson Park Elementary School | 1701 E. Seneca St | Neighborhood School | 1.1 |
| 112 | 2 | Magee Middle School | 8300 E. Speedway Bd | Neighborhood School | 11.4 |
| 113 | 1 | Manzo Elementary School | 1301 W. Ontario St | Neighborhood School | 2.8 |
| 114 | 3 | E.C. Nash Elementary School | 515 W. Kelso St | Neighborhood School | 3.0 |
| 115 | 4 | Palo Verde High School | 1302 S. Avenida Vega | Neighborhood School | 16.9 |
| 116 | 3 | Richey Elementary School | 2209 N. 15th Av | Neighborhood School | 3.7 |
| 117 | 6 | Rincon High School | 422 N. Arcadia Av | Neighborhood School | 17.5 |
| 118 | 2 | Sahuaro High School | 545 N. Camino Seco | Neighborhood School | 18.3 |

Appendix D – Parks and Facilities Plan

| Map # | Ward | Park Name | Address | Park Type | Park Acres |
|-------|------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| 119 | 4 | Santa Rita High School | 3951 S. Pantano Rd | Neighborhood School | 21.4 |
| 120 | 5 | Sunnyside High School | 1725 E. Bilby Rd | Neighborhood School | 0.7 |
| 121 | 6 | Townsend Middle School | 2120 N. Beverly Bd | Neighborhood School | 10.8 |
| 122 | 3 | Amphi Neighborhood Park | 510 E. Navajo Rd | Neighborhood | 1.8 |
| 123 | 5 | Utterback Middle School | 3233 S. Pinal Vista | Neighborhood School | 7.7 |
| 124 | 6 | Blenman Elementary School | 1695 N. County Club Rd | Neighborhood School | 2.9 |
| 125 | 6 | John B. Wright Elementary School | 4311 E. Linden St | Neighborhood School | 4.4 |
| 126 | 1 | Pima Community College (West) | 2202 W. Anklam Rd | Neighborhood School | 3.7 |
| 127 | 5 | Wakefield School | 101 W. 44th St | Neighborhood School | 5.0 |
| * | 1 | Desert Vista District Park | 6091 W Calle Santa Cruz | Neighborhood School | 8.3 |
| * | 1 | Dunbar School Park | 325 West 2nd | Neighborhood School | 0.5 |
| * | 2 | Hudlow Elementary School | 502 N. Caribe Av | Neighborhood School | 4.0 |
| * | 3 | Keeling Desert Park | 245 E. Glenn St | Mini | 0.7 |
| * | 6 | Miramonte Natural Resources Park | 701 N. Richey Bd | Mini Natural Resource | 1.0 |
| * | 3 | Rio Vista Natural Resources Park | 3974 N. Tucson Bd | Community | 38.0 |
| * | 1 | Rodeo Wash Park II | 621 W. Columbia St | Neighborhood | 6.2 |
| * | 6 | San Gabriel Park | 4056 E. Montecito St | Mini | 0.5 |
| * | 3 | Sixth Avenue Commemorative Pet Park | 2075 N. 6th Av | Special Interest | 1.6 |
| | | | | Total Park Acres | 3130.6 |

* Not shown on map

OPERATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Policies and Procedures

The City of Tucson Parks and Recreation Department has certain policies and procedures that should be developed to meet the goals of the Strategic Service Plan. These policies and procedures will help the organization achieve the outcomes that are desired by the public for the future. The Department needs to position itself to incorporate these policies as soon as possible to help move the organization forward.

Policies

The policies that are most critical and are recommended for immediate action are as follows:

- Establish a development impact fee policy and use other available methods to support open space acquisition and development of neighborhood parks. This policy needs to be coordinated with the Tucson Planning Department and with Element 12, Cost of Development, of the City's General Plan. All developer plans should include an opportunity for the Department to review the plans and approve them before they are submitted for final review.
- A pricing policy needs to be incorporated into the management of parks, recreation facilities and programs that supports operational costs. This will also encourage users to invest in them based on the level of benefit they receive over and above the general taxpayer of the City.
- A performance budgeting policy needs to be incorporated into management - a practice that includes meeting standards, performance measures and expected outcomes. This will support the City Manager's efforts to focus on entrepreneurial thinking and efficiency.
- Establish a policy that explores revenue sources beyond that of the sales tax and user fees.
- Develop a policy to enhance the Tucson Parks Foundation's efforts to support operations and capital costs.
- Establish an urban pathways utility policy to sell the development rights below ground to support operations and development costs for the urban pathways system is needed.
- Policies for each type of partnership the City manages are needed to clarify the relationships and increase the levels of equity between the City and the partner. The three partnership policies needed are the City's public/public policy, a public/not-for-profit policy and a public/private policy.
- A volunteer management policy is needed to support and develop the use of volunteerism in providing services to the public.
- A technology policy that specifies when technology equipment and software should be upgraded and a replacement schedule for each section that uses technology services is needed.
- A controlled and enforced lighting policy is needed to effectively use lighting and reduce utility costs for the City on game fields.
- A customer feedback policy is needed for seeking input from users on a consistent basis through effective use of pre and post evaluations, focus groups and user surveys.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

- A transportation policy needs to be considered with public transit authority working in cooperation with the City to provide free rides for youth to recreation facilities and programs.
 - A water management policy needs to be implemented that supports conservation efforts that are expected from the state for the Tucson area.
 - A consistent funding policy for open space needs to be incorporated by the City to ensure that land acquisition is keeping up with the growth of the community.
 - Staff evaluation policies should be changed to allow for 180 degree or 360-degree evaluations that will support meeting the Strategic Service Plan and build a better team in the organization.
 - A competitive outsourcing policy on when and how to seek outside management of a service is needed when it makes sense to look that direction.
- Procedures for hiring of fulltime and part-time staff, and all processes that apply to staff management.
 - Work order management on tasks that relate to all services provided by the staff.
 - Budgeting processes should be outlined.
 - Registration procedures should be outlined.
 - Contract management procedures.
 - Outsourcing management procedures.
 - Permit policies for activities and events in the City should be outlined.
 - Bidding procedures on capital improvements needs to be outlined.

These are but a few of the procedures that should be evaluated or implemented. Staff should be trained on flow chart management and efficiency practices.

All policies should be written with staff training included on how to interpret and manage these new policies for the future.

Procedures

The City needs to update its management procedures to improve efficiency and reduce bureaucracy. Many systems are in need of being updated. Ideally, the procedures should be developed in a flow chart format so they can visually explain the process to staff and illustrate how and where problems exist in the flow of work. Flow charts that are a priority and should be incorporated into the daily operations are as follows:

- Purchasing procedures as it applies to limit levels set by the City for supply bids, for emergency requests and for buying through state and federal contracts.

Pricing Policy

The Pricing Policy analysis is designed to provide City Leaders and staff consistent guidelines in pricing parks and recreation services. This allows the parks and recreation service users to better understand the philosophy behind pricing a service. Further, it shows how the level of benefit customers receive is translated into a price that is based on a set subsidy level or on the level of consumption above and beyond what the general taxpayer receives.

To gain and provide consistency among users and user groups, staff and elected officials should develop a philosophical foundation that incorporates a ten-step process to effectively develop a pricing policy.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

1. **Rationale:** The City, Parks and Recreation Department and staff agree that pricing services based on the benefits received is needed to help offset operating costs. They all agree that communicating this approach is a fair method to distribute City resources to the largest number of users of the system.
2. **Authorization:** The City should allow staff to develop prices for programs and services with the highest amount of flexibility to maximize all pricing strategies. Ideally, prices should be created based on levels of subsidy set after direct and indirect costs are established. By allowing the staff to work within a range, it will give the staff the ability to discount for primetime/non-primetime and season and off-season rates. It will also allow for group rate pricing.
3. **Revenue philosophy:** The City should adopt a revenue philosophy that not only promotes revenue production to offset operating costs, but also allows for revenues collected to remain in the fund where it was generated. In return, this will build in incentives for staff to be aggressive in seeking revenues. Also, user support for pricing of services will be developed because the dollars they invest in their recreation experience will be returned in better quality service and facilities.
4. **Citizen input:** Where possible, gain citizen input into pricing of services by allowing them to pick and choose what components of the service they want to purchase (multi-tiered pricing). This means allowing users to pick and choose what level of quality or quantity they want and pay accordingly. The concept that one price fits all services does not work effectively in maximizing pricing alternatives and in gaining revenue production.
5. **Program Services and Classifications:** Allow for pricing policy classifications of services. These classifications will include primetime, non-primetime, season and off-season rates, multi-tiered pricing, group discounting, volume food and beverage pricing and incentive pricing. These are all market strategies to encourage the users to move to a classification they are most interested in versus one-price fits all.
6. **Levels of public benefit:** Pricing of services should be based on the level of benefit received. The higher the benefit above what the general taxpayer receives should be priced accordingly. Recreation services, in general, are consumptive in nature. Once an activity is finished, the most tangible result is a memorable experience. Allowing prices to reflect users investing in themselves based on an individual benefit received is easy to communicate and understand.
7. **Cost accounting:** Allow the Department staff to develop an effective Activity Based Costing model that includes direct and indirect costs to determine cost per experience and subsidy levels before pricing services. This allows for efficient decision making in determining the best way to introduce the service or program in the most cost-effective manner.
8. **Pricing methods:** The pricing methods outlined in this policy should be incorporated into all program and facility development efforts.
9. **Consumer pricing expectations:** Users expect higher quality of services when pricing efforts are instituted. This will require program and facility standards to be implemented to meet the users' expectations and willingness to pay.
10. **Communication and evaluation:** In all cases, communicating the true cost of a service or program to users will increase their understanding of the value received. Messages that convey the program's benefits encourage significantly higher prices consumers will pay. In a recent study on pricing, consumers' willingness to pay for services increased by 33% by telling people the actual cost of

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

providing the service and by 36% by telling them the actual cost plus conveying program attributes.

Pricing Methods

There are basically three ways to establish a price:

1. Charging “the going rate” is non-controversial, but really has no rationale.
2. Differential pricing is an excellent method, as long as it doesn’t cause confusion. Different rates can be charged for:
 - Different participants (senior citizens, teens and disadvantaged individuals and groups)
 - Different products (heated pool vs. non-heated)
 - Different places (best field vs. poorer; best shelter vs. poorer) or different times (peak times vs. non-peak times and weekends vs. weekdays and season and off-season)
3. Pricing via “type of program continuum” (public vs. merit vs. private services) means offering the cost of a program at direct cost to the participant, minus the cost the agency would incur regardless if the program was offered or not, plus utilizing effective market techniques so the program is not over-saturated.

The objectives of pricing user fees are as follows:

Equity

Equity means those who benefit from the service should pay for it and those who benefit the most should pay the most. Public agencies typically offer three kinds of services. The type of service will directly determine the cost recovery strategy or pricing strategy to be used in pricing park and recreation services.

- 1) Public services normally have no user fee associated with their consumption. The cost for providing these services is borne by the general tax base. Public services are those services parks and recreation offer that provide all users the same level of opportunity to access the service. The level of benefit is the same to all users. Examples of public services are open public access to use a park, a playground, a trail, or a picnic area that cannot be reserved.
- 2) Merit services can be priced using either a partial overhead pricing strategy or a variable cost pricing strategy. Partial overhead pricing strategies recover all direct operating costs and some determined portion of fixed costs. The portion of fixed costs not covered by the price-established represents the tax subsidy. Whatever the level of tax subsidy, the Department needs to effectively communicate to the public the level of subsidy being provided. Merit services are usually services whereby the user receives a higher level of benefit than the general taxpayer and yet the taxpayer benefits as a whole because the service provides a more livable community and the service has ample public benefit as well. Examples of Merit services are providing swim lessons, youth sports, teenage programs and after school care for youth.
3. Private park and recreation services are those where only the user benefits. Most park and recreation agencies are pricing services using a full cost recovery strategy. The price of this particular service is intended to recover all fixed and variable costs associated with the service. Examples of private services are instructional golf and tennis lessons on an individual basis or high-end competitive individual sports for youth and adults where there is high cost to provide the service.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Revenue Production

Revenue production means that user fees from parks and recreation programs and activities will assist in the overall operation of the park and recreation budget. Revenue production gives the City needed cash flow for projects not budgeted in that year's budget. It gives the staff flexibility in providing services not normally provided through tax dollars.

Examples:

- Promotional dollars for programs and services: Revenue production gives the City in-kind dollars for grant matches. Revenue production helps offset tax dollars spent on a specific program that over time has lost support by the public, but demands more tax dollars to maintain expenses associated with a market that is losing interest.
- Tennis and day camp programs: Revenue dollars paid by individuals would place value on the experience that the individual is obtaining from the services provided by the Department and, in turn, develops a deeper commitment to the programs they help support.

Efficiency

Departments maintain efficiency by utilizing revenue dollars because expenditures are not made unless necessary revenues are available. Priorities in parkland, resources, and activities management are clearly defined because direct user dollars are associated with the activities the public wants provided. Cost tracking of dollars spent for each activity is documented. Pricing can achieve six positive results:

- 1) Reduces congestion and overcrowding
- 2) Indicates clientele demand and support
- 3) Increases positive consumer attitudes

- 4) Provides encouragement to the private sector (so it can compete with the City, and can reallocate their resources when necessary)
- 5) Provides incentives to achieve societal goals
- 6) Ensures stronger accountability on agency staff and management
- 7) Allows multi-tiered pricing to occur so those users who want a higher level of quality can pay for it.

Redistribution of Income

Redistribution of income means dollars generated from each activity are redistributed to the area it came from to pay for direct costs and indirect costs in some situations, and for future improvements associated with the activity. Example: Adult softball players pay fees for maintenance and capital improvements associated with the activity in which they choose to participate. Golfers user fees support operations and maintenance costs of the course and any capital improvement and replacement costs associated with the activity.

The Department should develop an Activity Based Costing Model. The true cost of each activity is defined as all direct and indirect costs associated with providing the service. The Activity Based Costing Model is presently not utilized to price programs and services consistently throughout the Department. Most of the pricing is determined by what other departments are charging or by how much the staff feels the participants are willing to pay. Some prices are based on direct costs only and indirect costs are not calculated into the pricing of the program.

It is recommended the City periodically review and document all fees and true costs for services provided. This will assist staff and Department management to evaluate which program fees

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

should be adjusted based upon the pricing policy or service. This is a good starting point to determine a benchmark. If the program fits the profile to increase prices, the true cost, including direct and indirect costs needs to be determined. Also, the level of investment the user is making and the City is making needs to be communicated.

Justification of Expenditures forms should be used to determine the true cost of the programs. The forms should be customized to match the City of Tucson's budget forms and line items. Incorporating the Activity-Based Costing Model into the form will ensure consistency throughout the Department.

In the Model, the number of participants determines the price of the program. The number of participants should be set at the minimum number to create a break-even point for the program. If program registration does not reach the minimum number of participants, the program should be cancelled and the participants moved to another program if possible. After the true cost of the program is figured, the appropriate tax subsidy level approved in the pricing policy can be applied to determine the price. Based on the community focus groups and the staff focus group information, the recommended subsidy levels per target group are shown in Table 9. The national subsidy levels are a cross section of parks and recreation departments across the United States. While these may not have application to Tucson, they are used as reference points for this policy.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Table 9: Tax Subsidy Level

| <i>Program Area</i> | <i>Recommended</i> | <i>Nationally</i> |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Adult Sports | 0% tax subsidy | 0% tax subsidy |
| Fitness/Wellness | 0% tax subsidy | 0% tax subsidy |
| Clinics | 0% tax subsidy | 0% tax subsidy |
| Rentals | 0% tax subsidy | 0% tax subsidy |
| Golf | 0% tax subsidy | 0% tax subsidy |
| Tennis | 0% tax subsidy | 0% tax subsidy |
| Contract Classes | 0% tax subsidy | 0% tax subsidy |
| Family Aquatic Centers | 10% tax subsidy | 10% tax subsidy |
| Dance | 10% tax subsidy | *0% tax subsidy |
| Arts Programs | 20% tax subsidy | 20% tax subsidy |
| After School Programs | 20% tax subsidy | *15% tax subsidy |
| Special Events | 25% tax subsidy | 25% tax subsidy |
| Outdoor Recreation | 30% tax subsidy | 20% tax subsidy |
| Youth Individual Sports | 30% tax subsidy | 30% tax subsidy |
| Day Camps | 30% tax subsidy | 10% tax subsidy |
| Aquatic Programs | 30% tax subsidy | 30% tax subsidy |
| Youth Team Sports | 40% tax subsidy | 40% tax subsidy |
| Senior Programs | 40% tax subsidy | *30% tax subsidy |
| Youth (13-15) Programs | 50% tax subsidy | 50% tax subsidy |
| Teen Programs | 50% tax subsidy | 50% tax subsidy |
| Flat Water Pools | 70% tax subsidy | 70% tax subsidy |
| Adaptive Recreation Program | 80% tax subsidy | 50% tax subsidy |
| Disadvantaged Youth / Family | 80% tax subsidy | 80% tax subsidy |

*These program areas can be more fee-supported based on the national figures although the community information showed that the recommended tax subsidy rate is more appropriate in the City of Tucson. Ideally, within the policy those areas that are more financially depressed should receive a higher level of subsidy based on the economic conditions of those neighborhoods.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

After the price is determined, it can be benchmarked against the going market rate in the area. The best way to benchmark is to compare a per unit cost (cost per game, cost per hour, cost per class, etc.) for activities that match the services provided. Length of program or season can be shortened or lengthened to make the price more appealing if necessary.

The City of Tucson should consider letting the public know the true cost of providing the program or service and the subsidy level used to determine the price. This is a great marketing strategy that helps the participants understand where their tax dollars are being spent and supports why the fee is charged. This strategy works best if the pricing policy is in place and the mandate for increasing revenue is made public. It is easier to market programs with price increases if an explanation for the increase can be provided.

Facilities should be upgraded and service should be improved when increasing user fees so participants can see improvements at the same time the fees increase.

The impact increased fees may have on the demand is called “elasticity of demand.” Elasticity depends on the availability of substitutable products and on the proportion of the fee to the total cost of the experience. If the demand is elastic, even though it drops some with an increase in price, the total revenue still increases. If the demand is inelastic, demand will drop so far that total revenue drops. Also, when you first charge for something previously offered for free or a low cost, it should be expected demand will drop initially and then return to its original level in a year or two.

“Willingness to pay” - A study done by National Recreation Parks Association documents that citizens generally find user

fees acceptable, and prefer the pay-as-you-go financing of facilities and services in indoor and outdoor recreation areas and programs. Any system of fees and charges may be found to have inequities for certain individuals or groups. Therefore, the Department must recognize these special situations and be flexible in order to meet them. Where individuals have a known inability to pay the established fees for basic programs and facilities, fees should be paid from special funds established for that purpose. Sponsors should be secured to develop this fund. Trade-out programs that allow participants to work and earn free passes or reduced program fees work well in some communities and place a value on the recreation experience.

Other Pricing Strategies

- Non-resident rates should be charged for all individual programs at full costs. A good marketing strategy is to set prices at the non-resident rate which can be termed market rate, and give the City of Tucson residents a 15% discount. This can also be rounded up to the next dollar for simplicity. This should become part of the pricing policy.
- Multi-child families would possibly sign up more children if the second child were discounted in the same program. This discount usually is between 20% and 30%.
- Rentals of facilities should be offered during non-prime time hours only. A true cost for set-up, clean up, utilities, etc. should be figured as well as a loss of revenue figure. For example, if a pool is rented out and the public is not admitted to swim, an average hourly non-prime time revenue loss can be calculated into the true cost of the facility. In most cases, renting a room off of the pool and

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

- allowing participants to swim within the rental fee is the best option and does not involve closing the pool to the public.
- Price all activities with the pricing policy and include in the pricing policy that the City of Tucson will not turn away anyone for recreational services who is unable to pay. Consider putting a work-related program in place. Promote it so that any child can earn admission/credit into a program of their choice, or towards a pass by performing minor duties for the Parks and Recreation Department under the supervision of staff. A program of this type is usually successful based on the value system of earning something rather than handing something out. Parents support this and publicizing a program like this gains community support rather than singling out underprivileged individuals or families. The program is open to anyone. The tasks performed are usually those not requiring power tools and are typically tasks that someone on the staff will need to do or something that will enhance the facility or program.
- Whenever referring to the cost of a program, whether verbally or in print, it is more customer friendly to refer to the cost as “price” versus “fee.”
- Earned income opportunities exist such as partnerships, use of volunteers, trade-outs, etc. that can help offset user prices. Staff is encouraged to supplement the revenue generated through the fees and charges by creating opportunities for private sector involvement in the delivery of programs and services. Opportunities are particularly apparent in the promotion of contract classes, special events, facilities, and recreation programs.
- Private sector partners are encouraged to attach their name to appropriate events in exchange for a sponsorship fee developed by program staff. Program staff must provide detailed benefits to be provided to the sponsor in exchange for their sponsorship fee.
- Partnership agreements between private and public sectors should be documented in all cases. Without a written agreement, future disagreements may be difficult to settle. A monetary value should be assigned to each partner’s contribution based on market rate. A matching (50-50) value is recommended as a goal in each situation. This would include all youth sports organizations. In Tucson, there are many non-written partnership agreements that should be documented and new working agreements should be established especially with youth sports groups.

Pricing Structure Recommendations

- Without knowing the true cost of the program areas studied, the following pricing recommendations will be market based within the local market area. A price per unit comparison will also be utilized along with national standards for like services. Some assumptions will be made when determining the price structure and should be checked with the recommended pricing process described in the previous section.
- Park and Recreation staff reserve the right to reject sponsorship offers if the sponsoring company is determined to be inappropriate for the particular activity, i.e., a Citywide community health fair sponsored by an alcoholic beverage company.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Recommended Pricing Strategies

The following areas were reviewed to determine the pricing structure recommendations. Without knowing the true cost of each program area, the following pricing recommendations are based on market rates, benchmarking, focus group information, and condition of facilities, amenities, and an understanding of current rates. In all cases, the true cost of each program must be determined including direct and indirect costs and the pricing strategy formula applied. The program areas listed have new pricing recommendations. Those programs not listed do not have new pricing recommendations and are priced appropriately with the pricing strategies the City has in place now.

Admission Prices: These prices help offset the cost associated with providing the service (Merit Service).

- Pool Admission Prices should be \$2 non-prime time to \$3 prime time for flat-water pools.
- Family Aquatic Centers Prices should be \$4 to \$7 when a pool of this type is developed.
- Park Entrance Prices should be established based on length of stay and the level of subsidy agreed to by the City and staff.
- Recreation Centers' drop-in prices need to be built around a \$2 or \$3 admission for drop in activities.
- Gate Admission for Adult Games and Youth and Adult sports tournaments should be priced at \$2 or \$3 per session, or a tournament pass offered for \$5 to \$10 per person.

Seasonal Passes should reflect the average pass price for a service or facility and discount it at least 15% off of admission price. (Example: if a person swims 30 times in the summer on

the average, a season pass 30 x \$3 admission equals \$90 discounted by 15% equals \$67.50 for the season pass.)

Reservation of Facilities Prices: These prices should be assessed for the right to exclusive use of a shelter, pool rental, game fields, gyms, meeting rooms, reception rooms etc. (private service) These prices should be developed at the City's true cost and compared to the private sector to determine the price. Prices should be developed on prime time and non-prime-time basis and season and off-season rates (Private Service).

Program Prices: The prices for lessons, camps, leagues, and classes should be based on a cost recovery level from 20% to 100% depending on the service provided. Set subsidy rates should be adopted by City staff (Merit Service).

Concession Prices: These prices should be based at 100% plus rates and priced by size of drink or food item, volume or group, value package, or target menu specials for the day (Private Service). The City out sources the majority of their concession operations. Concession percentage rates typically return 15 to 18% to the City on gross.

Permit Prices: These prices should be determined by the cost of the service, maintenance and security. These prices should not be subsidized (Private Service).

Rental Prices: These costs include rental of golf clubs, bicycles, sporting equipment, sound/stages, picnic tables, bleachers, tents, chairs/tables, and other related services. (Private Service) The City rental rates for these services are in line with market rates for these types of rental items.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Facility Use Prices: These prices should reflect the cost to provide the space and for any special arrangements that must be made to accommodate the user. Facility could include a softball/baseball complex, driving range, archery range, group campground (Merit Service). The City, for the most part, undervalues their facilities used for special purposes. A market rate study should be conducted for like kinds of facilities in the region and adjust prices accordingly, including prime time and non-prime time rates.

Special User Prices: These prices reflect discounts for seniors, juniors, teens, based on season pass/off season pass, coupons, memberships, location, volume, group (Merit Service). The City gives seniors the greatest level of discounts for services. The City should consider their position on senior pricing, especially when seniors spend more on recreation services for themselves than any other group in our society. The real discounts should be targeted to disadvantaged families and individuals to increase their access to programs and services. The City needs to adopt a philosophy to price services to the 80% who can pay versus the 20% who cannot.

Overall Goal of Pricing Program

The overall goal for the City of Tucson will be to develop a four-tiered pricing program.

1. Market Adjustment

The outcome goal is to significantly reduce subsidy levels in 3-4 years by increasing prices that reflect existing market rates for services and programs. This will include reducing the cost per experience/hour rate to \$3 or below within 3 to 4 years.

2. Activity Based Costing

The outcome goal will be to define true cost and adjust prices as necessary to cover costs, and then communicate to users at all levels the City's investment in the recreation experience.

3. Revenue Management

Incorporate costs for an increased level of maintenance above current levels when requested. Allow the community to buy the level of experience they want and price services accordingly.

4. New Revenue Resources

The goal of the staff will be to supplement operating budgets and create greater revenue sources to keep user prices down on non-consumptive services.

Revenue Sources

The City Attorney has indicated the City can enact the following enhancements:

Dedication/Development Fees*

These fees are assessed for the development of residential and/or commercial properties with the proceeds to be used for parks and recreation purposes, such as open space acquisition, community park site development, neighborhood parks development, regional parks development, etc.

**City has authority to enact development fees.*

Private Concessionaires*

Contract with a private business to provide and operate desirable recreational activities financed, constructed, and operated by the private sector with additional compensation paid to the City.

**City can and currently does contract for concessions.*

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Greenway Utility Fees*

Greenway utilities are used to finance acquisition of greenways and development of the greenways by selling the development rights underground for the fiber optic types of businesses.

**City already imposes a license or franchise fee on utilities for the use of City right of way.*

Lease of City Property*

These developers lease space from City-owned land through a subordinate lease that pays out a set dollar amount plus a percentage of gross dollars for recreation enhancements. These could include restaurants, sports complexes, equestrian facilities, and recreation centers and ice arenas.

**City can lease its property*

Licensing Rights*

This revenue source allows the Department and City to license its name on all resale items that private or public vendors use when they sell clothing or other items with the City's name on it. The normal licensing fee is 6 to 10% of the cost of the retail item.

**City can and does license various products*

Life Estates*

This source of money is available when someone wants to leave their property to the City in exchange for them to live on their property until their death. The City usually can use a portion of the property for park purposes and then all of it after the person's death. This revenue source is desirable to individuals who have considerable wealth and wish to avoid estate taxes upon their death. This allows the person to receive a tax deduction yearly on their property while still leaving a life estate. It is beneficial to the City because they do not have to pay for the land.

**City can and does accept devises of life estates*

Easements*

This revenue source is available when the City allows utility companies, businesses or individuals to develop some type of an improvement above ground or below ground on their property for a set period of time with a set dollar amount to be received by the City on an annual basis.

**City can impose financial requirements on private entities that use City property.*

Utility Roundup Programs*

Some park and recreation agencies have worked with their local utilities on a round up program whereby a consumer can pay the difference between their bill up to the even dollar amount and they then pay the Department the difference. Ideally, these monies are used to support utility improvements such as sports lighting, irrigation cost and HVAC costs.

**City can and does have this on its Water bills. City can request non-City owned utilities to implement such a program.*

Revenue Sources

The City Attorney indicates the City currently lacks the authority to enact the following enhancements:

Special Improvement District/Benefit District*

Taxing districts established to provide funds for certain types of improvements that benefit a specific group of affected properties. Improvements may include landscaping, the erection of fountains, and acquisition of art, and supplemental services for improvement and promotion, including recreation and cultural enhancements.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Creation of an Authority*

The City should adopt the creation of a recreation authority or district to create an atmosphere that would allow the Department to initiate long-term successes. Many successful park districts exist throughout the country and facilitate creative business approaches to leisure services that some governmental entities cannot provide. The consultant views this action as key to plan success.

**City can privatize recreational facilities.*

Real Estate Transfer Fees*

As cities and counties expand, the need for infrastructure improvements continues to grow. Since parks add value to neighborhoods and communities, some cities and counties have turned to real estate transfer fees to help pay for needed renovations. Usually transfer fees amount to ¼ to ½ % on the total sale of the property.

Designated License Plate for Parks*

This funding mechanism can be used to finance improvements or programs in the state or City through a designated license plate.

Sales Tax*

The revenue source is very popular for funding park and recreation agencies either partially or fully. The normal sales tax rate is 1 cent for operations and one half cent for capital. This tax is very popular in high traffic tourism type cities.

**A transaction privilege tax increase would require a charter amendment.*

Communities Facilities District*

The 1982 Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act (Government Code Sections 53311 et seq.) enables cities, counties, special

districts, and school districts to establish community facilities districts (CFDs) and to levy special taxes to fund a wide variety of facilities and services. The proceeds of a Mello-Roos tax can be used for direct funding and, in the case of capital facilities, to pay off bonds. Mello-Roos financing has similarities to special taxes and special assessments, and in some situations, it has advantages over both.

**City may only establish CFD by petition signed by owners of at least 25% of the affected land.*

Gaming Tax*

This tax is a common revenue source in the Midwest and Rocky Mountain states that allow gambling. These dollars come in a form of a percentage of what the City and State receive. This is a popular revenue source that is typically shared with schools, libraries and parks. *See Arizona Heritage grants program.*

Wheel Tax*

Many cities have a City sticker tax on vehicles based on the type of vehicle. This allows for park agencies to receive a portion of this money to cover the costs of roads, hard surface paths and parking lots associated with parks.

Business Excise Tax*

This tax is for new business that settles into a community. The tax is based on the wholesale cost of products sold. Park Districts in Illinois use this source as one of their revenue sources.

**No authority in Model City Tax Code*

**Information provided by the City Attorney's office. Further research would be necessary to fully analyze the legal and financial implications involved in implementing any one of the above funding sources.*

Other Funding Sources for Earned Income Opportunities to Add Value to the Plan

Park Impact Fees

Because the City is near build-out in some areas, park impact fees should be based on real estate transfer fees to maintain the infrastructure and (to support housing prices) Ideally, real estate transfer fees amount to one quarter or one half a percent of the selling prices. Fees then go back into supporting parks and recreation facilities and increase the value of the neighborhood for the buyer.

Corporate Sponsorships

This revenue-funding source allows corporations to invest in the development or enhancement of new or existing facilities in park systems. Sponsorships are also highly recommended for programs and events.

Partnerships

Partnerships are a joint development funding source or an operational funding source between two separate agencies, such as two government entities, a non-profit and a City department, or a private business and a City agency. Two partners jointly develop revenue-producing park and recreation facilities and share risk, operational costs, responsibilities, and asset management based on the strengths and weaknesses of each partner.

Foundation/Gifts

These dollars are raised from tax-exempt, non-profit organizations established with private donations in promotion of specific causes, activities, or issues. They offer a variety of

means to fund capital projects, including capital campaigns, gifts catalogs, fundraisers, endowments, sales of items, etc.

Recreation Service Fees

This is a dedicated user fee, which can be established by a local ordinance or other government procedures for the purpose of constructing and maintaining recreation facilities. The fee can apply to all organized activities, which require a reservation of some type, or other purposes as defined by the local government. Examples of such activities include adult basketball, volleyball, and softball leagues, youth baseball, soccer, and softball leagues, and special interest classes. The fee allows participants an opportunity to contribute toward the upkeep of the facilities being used.

Intermodal Transportation and Efficiency Act

This funding program, commonly called TEA-21 Grants was authorized by the Federal Government in 1991. Funds are distributed through the state. There are several million dollars in enhancement revenues available for transportation related projects, including bicycle and pedestrian trails, rail depot rehabilitation, landscaping, and beautification projects.

Land and Water Conservation Fund

These funds are awarded for acquisition and development of parks, recreation and supporting facilities through the National Park Service and State Park System.

General Obligation Bonds

Bonded indebtedness issued with the approval of the electorate for capital improvements and general public improvements.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Industrial Development Bonds

Specialized revenue bonds issued on behalf of publicly owned, self-supporting facilities.

Hotel, Motel and Restaurant Tax

Tax based on gross receipts from charges and meals services, which may be used to build and operate sports fields, regional parks, golf courses, tennis courts, and other special park and recreation facilities.

Grants

A variety of special grants either currently exist through the Federal and State governmental systems or will be established through the life of current and proposed facilities.

Annual Appropriation/Leasehold Financing

This is a more complex financing structure which requires use of a third party to act as issuer of the bonds, construct the facility and retain title until the bonds are retired. The City enters into a lease agreement with the third party, with annual lease payments equal to the debt service requirements. The bonds issued by the third party are considered less secure than general obligation bonds of the City, and therefore more costly. Since a separate corporation issues these bonds, they do not impact the City's debt limitations and do not require a vote. However, they also do not entitle the City to levy property taxes to service the debt. The annual lease payments must be appropriated from existing revenues.

Intergovernmental Agreements

Contractual relationships entered into between two or more local units of government and/or between a local unit of government and a non-profit organization for the joint usage/development of sports fields, regional parks, or other facilities.

Revenue Bonds

Bonds used for capital projects that will generate revenue for debt service where fees can be set aside to support repayment of the bond.

Bond Referendum

The plan recommends massive capital needs, renovation and construction of new facilities, to meet the needs and demands of residents.

Fees/Charges

The plan has documented that the Department is far undervalued and must position its fees and charges to be market-driven, based on both public and private facilities. The potential outcome of revenue generation is consistent with national trends relating to public park and recreation agencies, which generate an average 35% to 50% of operating expenditures.

Cost Avoidance

The Department must take the position of not being everything for everyone. It must be driven by the market and stay within the Department's core businesses. By shifting its role as direct provider, the City will experience savings by deciding whether or not to provide that facility or program. This is a cost avoidance. The estimated savings listed could be realized through partnering, outsourcing, or deferring to another provider in the provision of a service and/or facility.

Land Trust

Many counties have developed land trusts to help secure and fund the cost for acquiring land that needs to be preserved and protected for greenway purposes. This could be a good source to look to for acquisition of future lands.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Naming Rights

Many cities and counties have turned to selling the naming rights for new buildings or renovation of existing buildings and parks for the development cost associated with the improvement.

Rental Car Tax

This tax is designated for land acquisition purposes. Some cities and counties have used a percentage of rental car taxes to support land acquisition or improvements in parks.

Cell Towers

Cell towers attached to existing light poles in game field complexes are another source of revenue the City could seek in helping support the system. *The Department is currently using this revenue source for improvements.*

Private Developers

These developers lease space from City-owned land through a subordinate lease that pays out a set dollar amount plus a percentage of gross dollars for recreation enhancements. These could include restaurants, sports complexes, equestrian facilities, and recreation centers and ice arenas.

Benefit Assessment Act of 1982 (Government Code section 54703 et seq.)

This statute provides a uniform procedure for the enactment of benefit assessments to finance the maintenance and operation costs of drainage, flood control, and street light services and the cost of installation and improvement of drainage or flood control facilities. Under legislation approved in 1989 (SB 975, Chapter 1449), this authority is expanded to include the maintenance of streets, roads, and highways. As with most other assessment acts, cities, counties, and special districts that are otherwise authorized to provide such services may use it.

Facilities Benefit Assessment

The FBA ordinance establishes areas of benefit to be assessed for needed improvements in newly developing areas. Each parcel within an area of benefit is apportioned its share of the total assessment for all improvements (including those required for later development phases) which is then recorded on the assessment roll. Assessments are liens on private property as with the state assessment acts. Upon application for a building permit the owner of the parcel must pay the entire assessment (the payment is pro rated if only a portion of the parcel is being developed at one time). Payment releases the City's lien on the property. The funds that are collected are placed in separate accounts to be used for the needed improvements and do not exceed the actual cost of the improvements plus incidental administrative costs.

Food and Beverage Tax

The tax is usually associated with convention and tourism bureaus. However, since parks and recreation agencies manage many of the tourism attractions, they receive a portion of this funding source for operational or capital expenses.

Capital Improvement Fees

These fees are in addition to the set user rate for accessing facilities such as golf, recreation centers and pools to support capital improvements that benefit the user of the facility.

Merchandising Sales

This revenue source comes from the public or private sector on retail items in gift shops and pro shops for either all of the sales or a set gross percentage.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Concession Management

Concession management includes retail sales or rentals of soft goods, hard goods, or consumable items. The City either contracts for the service or receives a set of the gross percentage or the full revenue dollars that incorporates a profit after expenses.

Friends Associations

These groups are formed to raise money typically for a single focus purpose that could include a park facility or program that will better the community as a whole and their special interest.

Advertising Sales

This revenue source is for selling tasteful and appropriate advertising on parks and recreation related items such as in the City's program guide, on scoreboards, dasher boards and other visible products or services to expose the product or service to many people.

Irrevocable Remainder Trusts

These trusts are set up with individuals who typically have more than a million dollars in wealth. They will leave a portion of their wealth to the City in a trust fund that allows the fund to grow over a period of time and then a portion of the interest is available for the City to use to support specific park and recreation facilities or programs that are designated by the trustee.

Permits (Special Use Permits)

These special permits allow individuals to use specific park property for financial gain. The City either receives a set amount of money or a percentage of the gross service that is being provided.

Reservations

This revenue source comes from the right to reserve specific public property for a set amount of time. The reservation rates are usually set and apply to group picnic shelters, meeting rooms for weddings, reunions and outings or other types of facilities for special activities.

Catering Permits and Services

This is a license to allow caterers to work in the park system on a permit basis with a set fee or a percentage of food sales returning to the City. Also many cities have their own catering service and receive a percentage of dollars off the sale of their food.

Volunteerism

This revenue source is an indirect revenue source in that persons donate time to assist the Department in providing a product or service on an hourly basis. This reduces the City's cost in providing the service, plus it builds advocacy into the system.

Integrated Financing Act

This legislation creates an alternate method for collecting assessments levied under the Landscaping and Lighting Act, the Vehicle Parking District Law and the Park and Playground Act. This act applies to all local agencies. This act can be used to pay the cost of planning, designing, and constructing capital facilities authorized by the applicable financing act, pay for all or part of the principle and interest on debt incurred pursuant to the applicable financing act, and to reimburse a private investor in the project. It serves two unique properties: (1) it can levy an assessment which is contingent upon future land development and payable upon approval of a subdivision map or zone change or the receipt of building permits; (2) it allows the local agency to

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

enter into an agreement with a private investor whereby the investor will be reimbursed for funds invested in advance for the project being financed.

Parking Fee

This fee applies to parking at selected destination facilities such as beach parking areas, major stadiums and other attractions to help offset capital and operational cost.

Equipment Rental

The revenue source is available on the rental of equipment such as tables, chairs, tents, stages, bicycles, roller blades, boogie boards, etc. that are used for recreation purposes.

Entertainment Tax

This tax is on ticket sales for major entertainment venues such as concert facilities, golf tournaments, and car races type of venues to help pay for traffic control. Sports stars that come into the City may be taxed on the earnings they receive from their winnings. This tax also applies to video game machines.

Boulevard Tax

Homeowners who live along scenic boulevards pay this tax based on a lineal foot. The City of Kansas City has this tax in place and covers the cost of improvements, fountains and turf and landscape care.

Ticket Sales/Admissions

This revenue source is assessed on facilities for self-directed activities such as pools, ice skating rinks, ballparks and entertainment activities. These user fees help offset operational costs.

Special Fundraisers

Many parks and recreation agencies have special fundraisers on an annual basis to help cover specific program costs and capital projects.

Marketing of Services

The City needs to develop a Citywide marketing plan for the Department that focuses on all aspects of marketing of programs and services. Currently, the community feels that more efforts to communicate with them through more media sources are needed. The Department does not have a marketing section that coordinates all marketing efforts, all public relations efforts and image development for the Department. The staff needs to be trained on marketing practices in areas including customer service, customer feedback, and using demographics in making decisions on what types of programs are needed and where. The key elements of the marketing plan that should be instituted are as follows:

- Implementing and communicating user prices for services
- Updating the program guide to meet the community needs of residents
- Develop a marketing strategy for core services and core facilities
- Development of a marketing plan for the zoo, golf courses and recreation facilities.
- Establish a marketing strategy for non-core services
- Establish an age segment approach to program development.
- Establish a communication plan for external users and internal staff on key issues, operational changes, capital projects and the media.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

- Establish an image plan for the Department as it applies to programs, facilities, and parks.
- Conduct a capacity study of each recreation facility.
- Establish program lifecycles.
- Establish an advertising and promotion strategy for the Department.
- Update the existing signage in the parks and include bilingual signage.
- Establish standards in communication as it applies to program brochures, television, cable T. V., Internet web sites and online registration.
- Establish performance measures for all marketing efforts.
- Identify the economic impact of sports tourism on the City and report quarterly.
- Development of a property tax message for supporting park and recreation development in the City.
- Establish an overall theme for the Department.
- Establish a marketing strategy for volunteers and partners the City works with to increase awareness and advocacy.

The Department as a whole does not have a marketing strategy outlined for the Department. All Department staff does some marketing, but it is not coordinated throughout the City and standards are not consistent. The staff as a whole is frustrated with the existing efforts the Department applies to marketing. The cost of marketing should be included in the cost of programs and admission prices. Sponsorship efforts should be developed to support marketing efforts of events and activities provided by the City. Ideally, a marketing section should be created. The Department should make marketing a priority as part of management thinking. The City leadership should allow for the development of marketing efforts through the budget process and determine measurable outcomes to be established o track the cost benefit of marketing on programs, facilities and events in

the City. All groups who use City facilities should be required to work with the Department on marketing the Department as well as their events in their promotional materials and advertising efforts. The Department must coordinate this effort to communicate a consistent message.

Currently there is an inconsistent approach to customer service in the Department. The Department should develop customer training at all levels in the organization and incorporate measurable standards that can be tracked and posted to show staff how they are meeting their goals. Ideally, customer service should be developed as part of an overall management strategy. Training tools should include on-site training that focuses on standards, conflict resolution, solving problems and encouraging customer retention. Maintenance staff also should be included in customer service and an overall approach to support users' needs as it applies to staff maintenance of grounds, special use sites and recreation spaces.

The Department needs to have on-site trainers who establish ongoing training for full-time and part-time staff using established standards.

National Trends

Land Values

Discussion of land values and smart growth go hand-in-hand when communities begin to consider acquiring land for open space, parks and conservation purposes. Nationally, "smart" growth has become the "buzz word" that has begun to make an appearance in political arenas as well. To grow smart, a community must decide which lands to protect for recreation,

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

community character, the conservation of natural resources, and open space.

Evidence suggests that smarter, denser growth is an economical way for communities to grow. This is one reason why the American Planning Association, the U. S. Conference of Mayors, The National Association of Counties and many business leaders are getting behind the smart growth movement.

One 1998 real estate industry analysis predicts that over the next 25 years real estate values will rise fastest in communities that incorporate traditional elements of successful cities: a concentration of amenities, and integration of commercial and residential districts and pedestrian friendly configuration.

These studies and others point to the advantageous economics of open space and park planning. Land will generally not get less expensive than it is today; so securing open space and recreation land now is a good investment in a growing community.

Economic Impact

In parks and recreation management today, more agencies are tracking the economic impact of recreation facilities, programs and events in a community. Parks and Recreation Departments stimulate local tourism by providing targeted activities for visitors to the City, prompting them to extend their stay in the area. In addition, local parks provide locations for hosting community special events from concerts to athletic events and parades. These celebrations bring visitors into the local community where they spend monies locally to enjoy the activities provided. Tucson enjoys these experiences in a number of activities such

as tennis tournaments, PGA golf events and the many sport tournaments and invitational offered.

Quality of life is not a new concept. Its pragmatic nature is obvious to corporate site relocation consultants and real estate executives. Recreation amenities usually rank as one of the top five factors when business location and retention decisions are made. In one 1989 study by Cushman and Wakefield, quality of life for employees was found to be the third most important factor in the location decisions of a business.

Partnerships

Partnerships are a way of the future for park and recreation agencies across the country. There are three types of partnerships public agencies can develop. These include public/public, public/private, and public/not-for-profit partnerships. Each partnership type requires a separate policy of approach that is different from partnerships of the past due to the outcomes that partners are expecting.

Public/Public Partnerships seek to acquire a 50/50 equity level of resources each partner provides to the relationship. It is very important that the partners involved share a common vision, values, and an understanding that the relationship increases their impact of services to the community. Typical public/public partnerships include:

- City Parks and Recreation / School District
- City Parks and Recreation / Community Colleges
- City Parks and Recreation / County Parks and Recreation
- City Parks and Recreation / State Parks
- City Parks and Recreation / University
- City Parks and Recreation / Incorporated Cities

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Public/Private Partnerships focus on the public sector gaining revenue from profits of the private sector partner. These partnerships are based on efficient businesses operating public attractions or operating services the City does not provide. Public/Private partnerships require the City to closely track output measurements to hold the private partner accountable. The private partner is operating as an agent of the City and must adhere to a level of standard and expectations of the consumer and the City. Typical park and recreation private partnerships include:

- Golf course management of all operations including maintenance
- Tennis center management
- Catering services
- Restaurant services
- Marina operations
- Hospitality and conference management
- Camping and campground services
- Concession management at sports complexes
- Pool maintenance
- Lifeguard services

Public/Private partnerships generally cover three to four years for management contracts and 10, 15, and 20 years for lease management contracts. The private partner invests \$2-10 million in the public attraction and requires time to gain a return on their investment.

Public / Not-for-Profit Partnerships typically share the cost to provide the facility or program services. The not-for-profit typically has more flexibility to provide a service than the City and it allows both partners to gain revenues or efficiencies in

operations from the agreement. Depending on the amount of the investment by the not-for-profit, the partnership is based on 3, 5, 10 or 15-year agreements. Both partners must establish common vision and values. A good activity-based costing system is required to track and demonstrate the value that each partner is putting into the agreement. Examples of public/not-for-profit partnerships might include:

- City Parks and Recreation / Youth or adult sport associations, jointly developing the game fields and the not-for-profit operating the organization
- City Parks and Recreation / Hospital with the hospital providing the health and wellness services inside the multi-dimensional recreation center or fitness facility
- City Parks and Recreation / Environmental Associations where there is partnering on land trusts, environmental centers and greenway development coordination
- City Parks and Recreation / Friends of Specific Attractions where raising funds or assisting in managing the attraction is the focus
- City Parks and Recreation / YMCA, Boys and Girls Clubs an experience currently practiced by Tucson.

All three types of partnerships are designed to allow a park and recreation department to leverage their resources and build additional public advocacy and support.

Performance-Based Budgeting

The latest trend in budget development is focused on performance budgeting. Revenues are created from a variety of revenue streams. These are tracked against inputs, outputs, measurable outcomes, and performance levels. Each level of

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

performance is based on what the department achieves against the dollars requested in a given budget cycle.

This requires the department to implement a sound activity based costing system that tracks direct and indirect costs to create good baseline data. The department must measure the results of the products and services provided against a set of performance measures. Typical measures include the following:

- Customer satisfaction levels that need to be met
- Cost per experience achieved
- Capacity levels obtained
- Cost per unit / delivery of a service
- Retention levels obtained
- Partnering resources leveraged

Current General Fund operating budgets for City of Tucson Park and Recreation organizations are 90% subsidized, and the Golf Fund is non-subsidized. The national average subsidy rate is 50-65%. It is critical that the operating and maintenance costs of new development in Tucson be at a self-sufficiency rate of 30%(70% subsidized).

Matrix Management

Management trends are moving away from cylindrical forms of management to matrix management. Matrix management places a focus on pushing more decisions to lower levels of supervision in the organization. This allows work teams to exist between divisions in order to achieve results without pushing decision making up to management level supervisors. Work teams have measurable outcomes to be achieved. Managers have to focus on achieving outcomes and reducing bureaucracy versus micro-managing details in the operation. Supervisors work in the field and lead many of the work teams. In cylinder management, all

decisions are forced up to various levels of the organization based on the magnitude of the decision. Approval is sought in one division wanting to move a decision forward. Bureaucracy is heightened and not reduced.

Other management trends focus on outsourcing inefficient operations to businesses that can provide higher quality of services at a lower price. Examples for outsourcing services in other organizations around the U. S. include:

- Golf management
- Tennis management
- Horticulture management
- Turf management
- Construction management
- Forestry management
- Custodial management
- Safety management
- Concession management
- Marina management
- Trash Collection
- Wellness and fitness management
- Pre-school services
- Aquatics management
- Grant proposal writing

There is a true direct and indirect cost to compete against the private sector in order to evaluate efficiently outsourcing opportunities. A Request for Proposal process will help to establish which delivery method will bring the highest level of service for the most efficient price.

Appendix E – Operational Recommendations

Recreation Facility Trends

Multi-dimensional program design and intergenerational use in one setting are very popular trends in facility development.

These include large multi-dimensional recreation centers and family aquatic centers that can serve the entire family. Other facility trends include:

- Golf learning centers targeted to youth and beginning golfers
- Skateboard parks
- Dog parks
- Outdoor adventure centers
- Inline skate parks
- Sports complexes that are developed with six, twelve, or twenty plus courts or game fields in one setting
- Basketball academies
- Health and Wellness Centers

These types of facilities are usually open 90 - 105 hours a week when available and can be high revenue producers. If designed properly, these facility types have the capability to cover operating and capital costs.

Recreation Program Trends

Recreation program trends currently focus on quality over quantity. More intergenerational activities are being developed. Pricing services to benefits and programs that are shorter in length is the current trend.

- Senior Programs: Focus on providing different levels of senior services by targeting age generations such as - 50 to 60, 60 to 70, 70 to 80, and programs for 80+. Each ten-year target group has separate needs and abilities. Most seniors feel 15 years younger than they are and programs should reflect that feeling.

- Family Programs: Parents and children participate in activities together versus the parent observing the child. Programs include sports, arts, special events, wellness and fitness, trips, outdoor and environmental programs, aquatics, high-end computer games, and life skill courses.
- Roller Sports: Activities target in-line skating, hockey, skateboarding, BMX tracks and cycling
- Teen Services: Provide after school, evening and weekend social spaces for music, dancing, computer games, computer learning, places to hang out and co-ed activities.
- Outdoor Adventure: Programs in canoeing, sailing, fishing, kayaking, white water rafting, rock climbing, mountain biking, and camping.
- Sports Development Programs: Targeted to skill camps, tournaments, and specialty leagues for youth, teens, and adults. Co-ed sports programs for teens in soccer, softball, basketball, and volleyball are very popular. Older adult sports are very popular. Women's and girls sports are growing.

PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

MINI PARK

Size: 1 acre or less

Service Area: The immediate neighborhood to a distance of 0.25-mile radius.

Guidelines: Core/Mid-city: 1 acre/1000 persons; Edge/Future: 1 acre/1000 persons

Description:

Developed for passive recreation, this very small “pocket” park serves a variety of purposes, including streetscape, neighborhood gathering plaza, children’s small playground or just as open green space. These types of parks have a high maintenance cost associated with them that should be considered.

Typical Facilities:

- Landscaping (includes trees, turf and inert ground covers)
- Walkways
- Benches
- Picnic Tables and Barbecue Grills
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)
- Security Lighting

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK

Size: 1-15 acres

Service Area: The immediate neighborhood to a distance of 0.5-mile radius.

Guidelines: Core/Mid-city: 2 acres/1000 persons; Edge/Future: 2.5 acres/1000 persons

Description:

Developed to provide both passive and active recreation, this small park serves as a social and recreational focal point for the neighborhood. It is a destination within walking distance that provides ease of access for young and senior adult users, while serving users of all ages. Usually a stand-alone, this type of park can often be located adjacent to an elementary school to maximize resources to the benefit of the community.

Typical Facilities:

Through the input of a public participation process, these parks are designed to address the recreational needs of the community served, so they differ in character and reflect the community they serve. Organized sport activities are generally not desirable in these parks due to the impact on the neighborhood. Typical facilities include:

- Children’s Playground
- Open Turf Areas/Informal Youth Sport-oriented Spaces
- Volleyball Courts
- Fitness Course

- Multi-use Courts
- Off-street Vehicle Parking
- Landscaping (includes trees, turf and inert ground covers)
- Walkways
- Benches
- Picnic Ramadas, Tables and Barbecue Grills
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)
- Security Lighting

School/Park

School parks built on school property serves an important role in a park system. They are often the alternative to provide recreation opportunities where land is not available for acquisition or park development. They are an important means of maximizing limited resources to the benefit of the school and the community. Establishing a clearly defined joint-use agreement between the participants is critical to making the school park relationship workable. The type of facilities in a School/Park will vary depending on the needs of the community and school, but are often similar to those of a Neighborhood Park.

COMMUNITY PARK

Size: 15-40 acres

Service Area: The surrounding community to a distance of 1.0-1.5 miles radius.

Guidelines: Core/Mid-city: 3 acre/1000 persons; Edge/Future: 3 acre/1000 persons

Description:

Developed to provide more active and less passive recreation, this medium park serves as a social and recreational focal point for multiple neighborhoods or medium sector of the community. Designed to serve users of all ages, it is often located on arterial streets and is accessible by vehicle, bicycle or walking. Usually a stand-alone, this type of park can often be located adjacent to a high school to maximize resources and to benefit from joint-use of such facilities as athletic fields, multi-use courts and swimming pool.

Typical Facilities:

Through the input of a public participation process, these parks are designed to address the recreational needs of the community served, so they differ in character and reflect the community they serve. Typical facilities include:

- Swimming Pool
- Recreation Center
- Restrooms
- Children's Playgrounds
- Open Turf Areas
- Sports Fields (lighted)
- Volleyball Courts
- Fitness Course
- Walking/Jogging Path
- Multi-use Courts
- Vehicle Parking
- Landscaping (includes trees, turf and inert ground covers)
- Walkways
- Benches
- Picnic Ramadas, Tables and Barbecue Grills
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)

- Security Lighting

METRO PARK

Size: 40-200 acres

Service Area: The surrounding community to a distance of 2.5-3.0 miles radius.

Guidelines: Core/Mid-city: 3 acre/1000 persons; Edge/Future: 3.5 acre/1000 persons

Description:

Developed to provide more active recreation than passive recreation, this large park serves as a social and recreational focal point for a large area of the community. Designed to serve users of all ages and a diversity of community-based recreational needs, it is often located on major arterial streets and is accessible predominantly by vehicle or bicycle.

Typical Facilities:

Through the input of a public participation process, these parks are designed to address the recreational needs of the community served, so they differ in character and reflect the community they serve. Typical facilities include:

- Landscape Buffers (adjacent to neighboring development)
- Natural Landscape Areas
- Lakes
- Zoo (typically only one per community)
- Botanical Garden
- Water Features
- Outdoor Amphitheater/Concert Area
- Swimming Pool or Water-oriented Recreation

- Regional Recreation Center
- Restrooms
- Children's Playgrounds
- Open Turf Areas
- Sports Fields (lighted)
- Volleyball Courts (lighted)
- Fitness Course
- Multi-use Courts (lighted)
- Off-street Vehicle Parking
- Landscaping (includes trees, turf and inert ground covers)
- Walkways
- Benches
- Large Group Picnic Areas with Ramadas, Tables and Barbecue Grills
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)
- Security Lighting

REGIONAL PARK

Size: 200 acres or more

Service Area: The surrounding community to a distance of 7.0-mile radius.

Guidelines: Core/Mid-city: N/A; Edge/Future: 1 acre/1000 persons

Description:

Developed to provide active and passive recreation of the type listed under the other park categories, this very large park serves the entire community. Designed to serve users of all ages and a

Appendix F - Park Classifications

diversity of community-based recreational needs, it can provide extensive passive recreation and regional facilities that compliment our urban resources. It is often located on major arterial streets and is accessible predominantly by vehicle.

Typical Facilities:

Through the input of a public participation process, these parks are designed to address the recreational needs of the community served, so they differ in character and reflect the community they serve. Typical facilities include:

- Campgrounds
- Nature Center
- Wildlife Sanctuaries
- Landscape Buffers (adjacent to neighboring development)
- Natural Areas and Open Space
- Lakes and Water Features
- Zoo (typically only one per community)
- Botanical Garden
- Outdoor Amphitheater/Concert Area
- Swimming Pool or Water-oriented Recreation
- Regional Recreation Center
- Restrooms
- Children's Playgrounds
- Open Turf Areas
- Sports Fields (lighted)
- Volleyball Courts
- Fitness Course
- Multi-use Courts (lighted)
- Vehicle Parking
- Landscaping (includes trees, turf and inert ground covers)
- Walkways
- Benches

- Multiple Group Picnic Areas with Ramadas, Tables and Barbecue Grills
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)
- Security Lighting

SPECIAL USE PARKS

Special Use Parks cover a broad range of parks and facilities oriented toward a single purpose or unique function. These type of parks fall into a number of categories that include:

Sports Park

Size: Typically Community or Metro size parks

Description:

Developed to provide active sport-oriented recreation, this park serves the organized sports needs of a sector of the community. Designed to serve youth and adult sports, it also provides some of the recreational facilities found in the Community or Metro Park. It is often located on major arterial streets and is accessible predominantly by vehicle and bicycle.

Typical Facilities:

- Sports fields (lighted)
- Children's Playground
- Open Turf Areas
- Multi-use Courts (lighted)
- Restrooms
- Vehicle Parking
- Landscaping (includes trees, turf and inert ground covers)

- Walkways
- Benches
- Picnic Ramadas, Tables and Barbecue Grills
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)
- Security Lighting

Natural Resource Park

Size: Varies

Description:

For centuries, the desert provided a spacious home for a sparse population that learned to live in harmony with the land, harvesting its bounty and respecting its stark beauty. This heritage of vast expanses of open land and uninterrupted vistas of mountains, mesas and desert lowlands underlies today's commitment to protect, preserve and restore remaining open space resources. This type of park serves that end. It can be located in any part of the community where land remains relatively undisturbed.

Typical Facilities:

- Children's playground
- Limited and Small Open Turf Areas
- Vehicle Parking
- Landscaping (Native Plant Material Revegetation/Site Restoration)
- Trail Heads
- Pathways and Trails
- Educational and Interpretive Signage
- Shade Structures

- Restrooms
- Benches
- Limited Picnic Tables and Barbecue Grills
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)
- Security Lighting

Plaza

Size: Varies

Description:

Developed to provide an inviting passive green space, this outdoor space serves to accommodate pedestrians passing through, the businessperson needing a quiet place to take a break during a busy day, the shopper and bus patron needing a moment of rest. This outdoor space is an important and appreciated open green space often needed to soften the hard urban environment.

Typical Facilities:

- Landscaping (includes trees, turf and inert ground covers)
- Walkways and Paved Ground Surfaces
- Benches
- Picnic Tables and Game Tables
- Public Art
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)
- Security Lighting

Archaeological/Cultural Resource Park

Size: Varies

Description:

Developed to preserve our history and culture, this park serves to provide various education opportunities to the community. Designed to serve people of all ages, it can provide recreational opportunities and contributes to open space.

Typical Facilities:

- Trails and Paths
- Shade Structures
- Educational Exhibits and Signage
- Landscaping (includes trees shrubs and inert ground covers)
- Walkways
- Benches
- Picnic Tables
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)

River Park, Linear Park, Greenway

Size: Varies

Description: Trails are part of the heritage and lifestyle of the Tucson area. Hohokam Indians walked along the Santa Cruz River and the major streams that drain the surrounding mountains to hunt game and trade with distant villages. River Parks, linear parks along river tributaries and greenways provide today's hikers, urban walkers, joggers,

bicyclists, and equestrians the same connectivity. These corridors of open green space that preserve our natural resources and provide recreation opportunities for the community.

Typical Facilities:

- Trails and Walking Paths
- Bicycle Paths
- Open Green Space
- Fitness Course
- Vehicle Parking
- Landscaping (includes trees, turf and inert ground covers)
- Benches
- Picnic Ramadas, Tables and Barbecue Grills
- Support Amenities (such as trash receptacles, drinking fountains and signage)
- Security Lighting